THE DUALISM OF ETERNAL LIFE[1]

A Revolution in Eschatology

Stephen Speers Craig
Rochester, New York
May 1916.

INTRODUCTION.

A very few words must suffice by way of introduction to the contents of this volume. The ground covered is new, the study is original, the truths dealt with are the most momentous conceivable to the human mind. On this account I ask for that kind and degree of consideration which is due to those who seek to recover truth once known, but long lost and in its essential nature quite uncongenial to the natural heart of man.

In the summer of 1892, a book was placed in my hand with a request that I read it. The title was "Israel My Glory," by the Rev. John Wilkinson, president of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews. The reading of that book marked an epoch in my life. From that time forward my outlook on the character and destiny of the Church and the world began to be revolutionized, and the process still continues its panoramic unfolding with ever-deepening amazement and ever-increasing joy. Year by year the beauties and verities and glories of the Word of God, both written and Living, have slowly but surely tightened their celestial grip on my soul, until with some tangible degree of appreciation I can enter into the spirit of the great Apostle of the Gentiles when he exclaimed, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out." I have never known, even before conversion, what it was to doubt the truth of God's word. But when the new light dawned in 1892 and I began to see how fearfully I had been deceived and misled concerning the character of the present age as portrayed by infallibly inspired prophets and apostles, I was led to wonder if I had not been misinformed by "Mother Church" on other equally important subjects; and experience has taught me that this suspicion had a wondrously solid basis in fact. As a consequence I began to see that there was a faith which was nothing more than an easily going Laodicean indifference, whose proper name was heathenish credulity; and that on the other hand there was a skepticism which was one of the most essential elements in the highest order of Christian virtue.

---

[1] [Accessed 2012-13 at:-www.InTheBeginning.org; originally, found also at Google Books and www.schoettlepublishing.com and https://www.worldcat.org/title/dualism-of-eternal-life-a-revolution-in-eschatology/oclc/682063490?referer=br&ht=edition. Now lastly at W. Tindle's most excellent website: The Millennial Kingdom as "The Dualism of Eternal Life **NEW 2019**"—esn.]

Thus, while never doubting the truth of God's word, I have been led to doubt men's opinions concerning it. And one mark of said doubt is that it is both subjective and objective. My own opinion as a man is no better or worse than the opinion of any other man, except as it agrees or disagrees with the facts of the revelation of God in Christ; for in Him we have absolute truth so far as the revelation goes. It will yet go much further and deeper and higher.

In the study of God's word, especially during the last fifteen years, I have been learning to put more and more emphasis on three points:

1. To make sure that I had the proper translation of the original.
2. To make equally sure of the proper interpretation of the right translation. The former is of little value without the latter.
3. To make especially sure of the proper application of a given passage after I had assured myself that I had given due attention to the first and the second.

All three are abundantly illustrated in this volume. Here, at the final analysis, is the test of genuine scholarship, and in the exact application of these three vital principles we will discover the proof as to whether a given preacher or theologian is, or is not, living in vital union with the Great Head of the Church.

While the nature of the discussion necessitated somewhat frequent reference to the original languages in which both Testaments were written, I wish to disown any pretension to expert knowledge in either. Fortunately this was not necessary. Besides, if the following argument proves anything it is that the men who have claimed expert knowledge in these lines have shamefully erred, and thereby deceived the people of God, and that generation after generation for hundreds of years. The essence of the problem of the knowledge of God lies in the fact that theology, unlike the abstract sciences, say mathematics, is a most concrete affair, involving the normal operation of the mind, the will and the heart. Thus the real causes of failure to properly interpret the word of God lie back of the mind in the region of volition and affection. There is nothing in man stronger than his affections and in proportion as these are fixed in an evil direction truth and righteousness and God are excluded and the doors of the heart firmly barricaded heavenward.

We are living in tremendously critical days when all eyes are focused on the greatest military conflict in the history of the world. Throughout a very large portion of the earth militarism is triumphant. The world problems of today are not new. They are old as the history of the race. Owing, however, to the commercial federation of the nations and the advance of science in all kinds of invention, and in the production of wealth, the problems which were once local, or at most provincial, have taken on an imperial and

cosmopolitan character. In proportion as the world-system has become organized for commercial purposes and that on a basis of legalized lawlessness, the nations have found it necessary to strengthen by means of armies and navies the dams they had built to hold back, if possible, the threatening floods of illegalized lawlessness. But the higher and stronger they built they only increased the pressure; and now, as was inevitable, the dams are giving way in all directions, and the result is universal anarchy merging into universal chaos.

But the most significant sign on the world's brooded horizon at the present time is not found in international politics, nor in the devious and treacherous methods of international diplomacy; no, nor yet in thunder and smoke and hilarious intoxication of militarism. Where then? [It is] in the desperately corrupt condition of modern theology. Only a few days ago three examined candidates for the Christian ministry, were being examined before the New York Presbytery with a view to ordination; and, so says the report, they, verbally and in writing, affirmed their disbelief in the Virgin Birth of the Christ and in the Resurrection, and in this tremendously far reaching negation of the very foundations of Christianity they were substantially upheld by the Court. This has its significance in that it is symptomatic of a general condition throughout the religious world. In comparison with this daring attitude of men to God and His Christ, the world's greatest military conflict, considered as an exhibition of brute forces, is nothing more than a transient episode.

Reviewing the history of Christendom for the last sixteen hundred years, there is one thing that men seem determined to do at any cost; and that is that they will not listen to what the God of Heaven and Earth has said, and is still saying, concerning the character and course and doom of modern civilization. Politicians, economists, educationists, scientists, and last, but not least, the theologians, vie with one another in their eulogy of the possibilities and perfections of humanity by what they are pleased to call education and culture. But listen to what Jehovah hath said:

> ***"Therefore wait ye upon Me, saith Jehovah, until the day that I rise up to the prey; for My determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger; for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy" (Zeph. 3:8; see also Rev. 19:11-21).***

The present world war is but the prelude to a deeper and bloodier tragedy; and the root cause of it all is ecclesiastical antichristianism, materialized commercialism, political opportunism, and general, practical atheism. There never yet was, and there never can be, a war that did not have its basis, at the last analysis, in a false relation of men, and churches, and

governments to God and His Christ. Never was there a nation that suffered more, through war or any other cause, than it deserved to suffer, as a nation, in order to square its accounts with God for national sins. When the equation is squared the account will be cancelled. There is no future hell for nations as such; hence the necessity for squaring the accounts here and now.

SOME EXPLANATIONS.

As this book is written specially for laymen I feel disposed to make a few explanatory remarks:

". The thought moves almost constantly within the lines of that branch of theology which is technically called eschatology. This term is derived from two Greek words; namely, the adjective *eschatos* (ἔσχατος), meaning, last; and the noun *logos* (λόγος), meaning, speech, or discourse. That is, discourse on the last things: That department of Bible knowledge which treats of the culmination of the present age, of death and judgment, heaven and hell; the intermediate state and the eternal state.

2. In reference to the Second Coming of Christ Christians are divided into two schools: The Premillennial and The Postmillennial. The first syllable in each word is a preposition: *Pre* meaning "before"; and *Post* meaning "after". The other two roots are *mille* a thousand, and *annus* a year. Both schools agree that before the end of the world there is to be a thousand years of universal peace, according to Rev. 20:1-6. The former say that the Second Coming will take place before the millennium, and will be the cause of its introduction. The latter say that the Second Coming will not take place till after the millennium, and that it is part of the mission of the Church in the world to introduce it by the preaching of the Gospel, by education and moral reform. The two theories, if I may so call them, are really two systems of interpreting the Bible and are as different and antagonistic as light and darkness.

3. The Greek word *aiōn* (αἰῶν) is usually rendered into English as "aeon", or "eon". I prefer, however, to retain all the letters and simply substitute the English as above. The "o" is long and is equivalent to *aioon.* But except where the plural forms occur we will spell it with one o.

I have no thought of claiming that the work is free from mistakes. Pressure of other work will account for some of them, and human infirmity for others. But of one thing I am certain: The main line of argument which runs through the book is established and will never be overthrown, for it rests securely on the immutable word of God. The beloved evangelist concludes his Gospel with the words:

THESE THINGS ARE WRITTEN THAT YE MIGHT BELIEVE.

To believe is to know. Bible truth was given to be known, and after one has spent many years in the School of Christ (Luke 14:25-35) it is possible and permissible, and honoring to God, to say "I KNOW"; and to go even beyond that and declare, "I KNOW, and I KNOW that I KNOW." And to do so is neither presumption nor egotism. And he, who knows that he knows, also knows that the man at the other end of the line does not know what he thinks he knows (1 John 4:6). The positive and negative phases of truth are so related that the thinker cannot be more definite at one end than at the other. This relation, even though by way of antithesis, is involved in the very nature of subject and object. Affirmation and negation must go hand in hand so long as we live in a world like this.

It was my wish to dwell at some length on the considerable volume of literature on the subject of biblical eschatology which has come from the orthodox press during the last few years and to point out its essentially rationalistic character; but space will not permit at present. By the way, that word "orthodox" may be used in two different senses: (1) that which is right (*orthos)* according to Bible Standards; and (2) that which is right according to Church creeds; or, better still, that which expresses the general consensus of Church opinion at the present time. The word is used exclusively in the latter sense in this volume.

It is a matter of fundamental importance to recognize the wide gulf which separates apostolic from post-apostolic Christianity; and especially from present day Christianity. In confirmation of this fact I will cite a quotation from a Churchman of high standing, in the hope that it may set some person thinking:

> ***"The first period is that which contains the great question, almost the greatest which ecclesiastical history has to answer,-how was the transition effected from the age of the Apostles to the age of the Fathers, from Christianity as we see it in the N. T., to Christianity as we see it in the next century, and as, to a certain extent we have seen it ever since? No other change equally momentous has ever affected its fortunes, yet none has ever been so silent and secret. This chasm once cleared we find ourselves approaching the point where the story of the Church once more becomes history-becomes once more the history, not of an isolated community, or of isolated individuals, but of an organized society incorporated with the political systems of the world." –Stanley's History of the Eastern Church.***

Just think of her who should have been the Virgin Bride of Christ thus playing the harlot so shamelessly. But here type and antitype perfectly agree (Ezekiel 16 and Revelation 2 and 3). It is to the faithful in these conditions of apostasy that the Holy Spirit appeals so significantly in 2 Cor. 6:14-1 8. These are awfully solemn words. “Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach” (Heb. 13:13). But let us see to that we do not take the spirit of the camp with us. Dean Stanley never wrote truer words than those contained in the above quotation. Between apostolic and historical Christianity there is a great gulf fixed, and John and Peter and Paul are saying “they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence (except by the way of the Cross).” Education and culture are no substitutes for atonement and the new birth.

If anyone should affirm that the tone of the book is pessimistic, I both admit and deny the charge. So far as the possibilities of any moral uplift of humanity are dependent on legislation, education and culture, while the whole world lies in the wicked one (1 John 5:19), I am incurably pessimistic; as hopelessly so as the weeping prophet of Judah’s Babylonian captivity was of political and religious conditions in his day. But from the standpoint of the prospects of humanity under the kingly rule of the Christ of God, now about to be inaugurated, I am as optimistic as the sweet Singer of Israel; as hopeful as was he who interpreted the night vision of Babylon’s greatest king and foretold the rise and fall of successive Gentile nations and empires until He come whose right it is to rule the nations of the earth; yea, as hopeful as was the lonely Seer in Patmos when in the two last chapters of his sublime Apocalypse he proclaimed in letters of fire and garniture of gold and sweetest cadences of celestial choristers the unutterable bliss of consummating and consummated redemption.

In this hope I commit the book to the winds and the waves of the world’s adverse criticism, and to the scorn of its silent contempt; but at the same time to the care of Him Who hath His way in the sea, and His path in the great waters, and Whose footsteps are not known; and Who, in a little while, will say to the warring nations of earth, “Peace!, Be Still!,” and to the world’s Babylonian chaos, “Let there Be Light!”, and that word of command which called Lazarus from the dead will do what all the armies and navies of the world have never done and never can do. Till then, let us wait, and watch, and work.

Rochester, New York, S. S. Craig May 1916.

CHAPTER 1: EXCAVATING FOR BURIED TRUTH.

“It is owned, the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood; if it ever comes to be understood before the

restitution of all things, without miraculous interposition, it must be in the same way as knowledge is come at by the continuance and progress and liberty; and by particular persons attending to, comparing, pursuing intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made; by thoughtful men's tracing on obscure hints-as it were, dropped us by nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance. Nor is that all incredible what a book, which has been so long in possession of mankind, should contain many truths as yet undiscovered." Butler's Analogy.

On a certain morning in the later part of December 1913, we were at worship in the home. The Scripture portion for that morning was the 18th chapter of Luke. The narrative of the Rich Young ruler seemed to grip attention; and when the last two verses of the account were reached something happened which cannot be easily described in words. We were not conscious of being in an especially spiritual mood at the time. Nevertheless something happened which has changed a good many things and the process of transformation is still going on.

It was as if instantaneously and supernaturally a ray of light was flashed into my mind and heart. After a pause of a few seconds I said to my wife, "I see something new; and then finished the chapter. When worship was over I at once took my Bible again and began to seek confirmation, or refutation, of the vision. With note book and pen in hand the New Testament was examined from beginning to end with the greatest care and much prayer for guidance, the search extending over many months and the results filling several notebooks. Since then much truth by way of confirmation has been found in both Testaments. There is now absolutely no doubt in the writer's mind that a truth of apostolic authority has been recovered; and that he is wholly indebted to the goodness and mercy of God for such a gracious revelation. It is not often that he gets truth in this way. The experience was just a little touch of Eph. 1:17-18. Such moments of union and communion between the Vine and the branches ought to be far more common.

May both the writer and the reader be graciously favored by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him as in the following pages we proceed to dig through the successive strata of traditional deposit, ecclesiastical presupposition and prejudice in order to the recovery and due recognition of a truth which in the primitive Church played no small part in keeping the disciples of the ascended Christ in a state of grace, of

watchfulness, and of submission to the Word and Spirit of God; and for the want of which today Christians are for the most part living in a state of self-sufficiency and practical indifference to the claims of God. The Holy Spirit has foretold us it would be so.

The method of procedure in exposition is the opposite of the one pursued in the first study. In that we began with a principle which was allowed to unfold itself organically from centre to circumference. In the present study we begin at the circumference and work inward to the principle. And once a biblical principle is found, it matters not where, it will be met again and again, modifying, expanding, intensifying, and adding or subtracting as the text and context may require. Let the reader therefore be prepared for new meanings in words, in phrases, and also new conclusions made necessary by new premises.

Before coming directly to the study of this interesting narrative we will notice three significant facts:

1. The narrative (Luke 18:18-30) is recorded by all three of the Synoptic Evangelists. This should warn us that we are to look for something of more than ordinary importance.
2. At the turning point in the record Jesus introduces His exposition by a solemn and instructive, "Verily I say unto you."
3. All three, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, introduce the narrative of the conversation between Christ and the Young Ruler immediately after the account of the little children being brought to Christ for His blessing. The disciples resented this act as an intrusion; but He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." On an earlier occasion Jesus had said to the twelve when He saw the spirit of carnal rivalry moving in their hearts: "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted (delivered from the power of natural selfishness) and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt.18:1-3). Surely the men addressed were saved (John 15:3; 17:11-12); but they were not then in the kingdom in the sense which Jesus meant, and they knew it. The kingdom referred to belongs to the age to come. Their need was the very need of the Young Ruler. Their danger was petty, selfish rivalry; his danger was wealth. Let the reader ponder this thought carefully and at once he will begin to suspect the traditional interpretation of our narrative—that he is a sinner seeking salvation.

We will now repeat the account as given by Luke:

> "And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none *is* good, save one, *that is,* God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do

not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother. And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up. Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich. And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they that heard *it* said, Who then can be saved? And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God. Then Peter said, Lo, we have left all, and followed thee. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, Who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." Luke 18:18-30

Let the reader compare and contrast the accounts in Matthew 19:16-30 and Mark 10:17-31.

Note specially that what Matthew calls the kingdom of heaven, Luke and Mark call the kingdom of God. This does not imply that in all respects they are exactly identical. For present purposes, however, they are. Luke says the young man was a ruler, perhaps of the synagogue, possibly of the Sanhedrin. Matthew and Mark close the narrative with the solemn words, "But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last first."

THE YOUNG RULER ALREADY SAVED.

The fact we wish to establish in our study of the narrative is that this Young Ruler is already saved, in the only sense in which a Jew, or indeed any man, could be saved prior to the vicarious death of Christ on Calvary. This man was no legalist, and he was not a hypocrite. His humility, earnestness and enthusiasm put to shame the great mass of Christian profession of today. In proving, specifically, that this Young Ruler was already a saved man when he came to Christ, we will thereby prove some other things incidentally; namely, for example, that the governing desire in this young man's heart ought to be the governing impulse the heart and life of every child of God on earth; and, further, that his loss in the age to come is going to be shared by the vast majority of the saved of this Christian dispensation. This being so we are not only all equally interested in the correct interpretation of the narrative as a matter of sound exegesis; but also because his opportunity then is our opportunity today, and also his peril then is our peril now.

Before coming to a constructive study of the passage let us note a fact on the negative side as affording strong presumptive evidence against the traditional interpretation.

While all the preachers, commentators and exegetes have been able to examine, are of one mind in the opinion that the Young Ruler was unsaved when he approached Christ, and that the way in which he presented his case proves him to have been a legalist, we have yet to find the first man who has given any valid reason for thinking so. They assume the fact and then proceed to draw their conclusions and make their observations. This popular method of studying God's Word justifies the following general statement; namely, dogmatic deduction based on gratuitous assumption is the curse of theology, philosophy and science. No real lover of Christian freedom and manhood can afford to be continually deceived and misled and cheated by any such cunning wiles of the great enemy of God and man. Let us take nothing for granted.

A PRELIMINARY SUGGESTION.

In turning back the pages of history a thousand, or two thousand years, to study a particular event, or series of events, there are two problems ever standing in the foreground which must be dealt with and if possible solved in some degree, before the matter in hand comes under consideration. One at that end and the other at this end, namely:

1. Objectively—What was the historical setting of the said event considered socially, politically, religiously? Who were the actors in said event and what was their relation to one another and to their environment? What elements of fact and fiction were involved in the situation? What did the speaker, or speakers, really mean in what he or they said? This is no easy problem and yet it has very much to do with a true estimate of the event in question, the study of our narrative concerning the Rich Young Ruler.
2. Subjectively—What elements of fact and fiction hold the mastery in the inner being of the student, or investigator, and thereby affect the very warp and woof of his own mental, moral and spiritual make up; and thus, in the one case, opening his eyes to see things as they are in the light of actual truth; or, in the other, effectually perverting and nullifying his power of vision and compelling him to arrive at false conclusions? And these are not really two problems, but two phases, or sides, of one and the same problem, the correlation of subject and object. For example, how utterly impossible for the typical Jew of today, or any day, to form a true estimate of the Christ of the Four Gospels. An inner force impels him to falsehood.

If only truth is fact, and the antithesis of truth is fiction, then what a vast amount of unreality there is in the ponderous world-system of today, view

it from what standpoint we may, socially, politically or religiously. For religion divorced from the living Christ becomes part and parcel of the world-system. The Christian sees the error of the Jew and is convinced of the folly and fatality of his course. But, inconceivable as it may seem, I wish to affirm modestly that since the days of St. Augustine to the present there has been and is no representative system of theology, Roman Catholic, Greek, Lutheran or Protestant, which has not erred at this very point. The creeds, confessions and theologies of Christendom know the Savior theoretically, as the Son of God, but they do not know Him truly as the Son of Man; they know Him as Christ but they do not know Him as the Christ. Nevertheless, God has not left His Son without witnesses in respect to His true Messianic character and claims.

The primal condition of my ability to emancipate the truth involved in the object of my contemplation from its fictitious historical entanglements is that I first eliminate the fictitious from my own mental and spiritual constitution; and thus free my personality from what is fictitious in my environment whether near or far as to space or time. By full and continuously intensifying surrender to Christ this can be done. This is what He came to do in the "joint-heirs" with Him in the coming kingdom. Reader, where do you stand in reference to the above problem? This will have much to do with what you may see in the following exposition.

CONSTRUCTIVE STUDY OF THE NARRATIVE.

The Young Ruler's question, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" Let us seek for the basis of this earnest interrogation in the prophecies of the Old Testament, and in Jewish hopes at the time of our Savior's Advent.

1. It is very manifest from even a superficial of the Old Testament that the theocracy established in Israel through the agency of Moses was no mere experiment in government. It was the earnest of a theocratic rule, or kingdom, which is yet to be, and which will embrace the whole world.
2. God promised David a Son who should sit upon is throne forever (2 Sam. 7:1-14). Solomon was a type of the true Son of David—the Christ, the Messiah. The One who has the keys of Hades and Death, has also the key of David (Rev. 1:18; 3:7). Peter at Pentecost declared that David was not yet ascended into the heavens (Acts 2:34). David not withstanding his own comparative failure, and the actual failure of his successors on the same throne, knew and believed that God would give him a Son to sit on his throne and establish it forever:

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;" Acts 2:29-30.

This was the hope of all the prophets and teachers in Israel from Moses to Malachi (Isaiah 11; 12).

3. When the apostasy of Judah became such that God could tolerate their wickedness no longer, He sent them into the Babylonian captivity. At the same time that God took governmental power in the earth from Israel, and the kingship from the line of David, and gave both to the Gentiles in the person of Nebuchadnezzar, He did so only for a time. The times of the Gentiles are definitely limited in both Testaments (Dan. 2:44; and Luke 21:24). The sovereignty must return to Judah, not to the two tribes only but to the twelve, then no longer divided but one forever (Isa. 11:13; Ezek. 37:15-28; Amos 9:11-15). This is guaranteed by the Abrahamic Covenant.

4. This hope of the Old Testament is carried over by the Holy Spirit into the New Testament; and, with a vastly enlarged conception of the Kingdom, becomes the hope of the apostles, the prophets and all the saints of the primitive Church.

a. The angel Gabriel assured Mary that her Son was the Royal Heir to the Throne of David, and that He would in due time be placed there.

"And the angel said unto her, 'Fear not Mary for thou hast found favor with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shall call His Name, Jesus. He shall be Great and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the Throne of His father David" (Luke 1:30-32).

What a fearful evidence of the corruption of the human heart and the ruin of the intellect, when men, saved men, can lend themselves to a spiritualizing process the effect of which is to destroy the testimony of the Holy Spirit concerning the kingly mission of the Son of God and the overthrow of Satan's power in the world. But they do it to their own undoing. The failure of the Young Ruler and its dispensational consequences will be found in the judgment day to the little in comparison with theirs. We have spoken above of the vicious process of basing dogmatic deduction on gratuitous assumption; and we may add that the whole history of the corruption of Christianity affords no more damaging

example of the inherent evil of the process than is found in the traditional theory of post-millennialism.

b. The wise men asked, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?"

c. Jesus Christ as the Son of David claimed the Throne of David and His claim was rejected by the Jews. Instead of crowning they crucified Him (Matt. 22:42-45; 23:37-39; 21:1-9).

d. It is an unmistakable fact, to those who have the ability to see facts, that the early part of Christ's ministry was occupied almost wholly concerning the Kingdom and that in the sense of Himself as the Son of David reigning on David's Throne (see Matthew, chapters 1–12). Matthew is specially the Gospel of the Kingdom. The rejection of the Christ by the Jews resulted in their rejection by God, the postponement of the Kingdom, and the introduction of the present parenthetical dispensation during which God is taking out of the world a people for Himself, but is not seeking to save the world. The latter is impossible while Israel is in bondage and Christ-King is personally absent.

e. The apostles taught that that which constituted the hope of Israel as an earthly people is also the Hope of the Church in this dispensation as a heavenly people. Titus 2:11-13.

Here then we have the sufficient basis of the Young Ruler's question and the ground of his hope. As a God-fearing Jew and an honest son of Abraham he cherished the common aspirations of his fathers. He was building on the promises made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 12:1-3; 13:14-18; 15:1-18).

Very true, indeed, his notions of the kingdom were crude; but not nearly so much as that of the average Christian today. Besides, if after the apostles had spent three years in the school of the Great Master, and their notions were still very crude, surely we can afford to be somewhat charitable toward this heroic young man. His motive was pure, his manner respectful, and his enthusiasm such as may well be copied in the twentieth century of our Lord.

THE QUESTION.

What shall I do to inherit eternal life?

The first word here that demands attention is the little but mightily potent "I", the mysterious Ego. What fathomless depths lie unexplored in the heart of this formally insignificant little dissyllable? Here is a subject, yonder is an object. How shall I effect their correlation; or, failing to correlate them, how long must I go on at war with both; or, is there something in both subject and object not reconcilable? And how shall that something be determined so that I may know what is real and what is

fictitious in myself and the not-myself? Since the object is infinite and the subject is in all points the counterpart, must not my salvation and the salvation of the universal cosmos be in some way bound up in some mysterious unity of origin, process and destiny? And if there is to be a Savior must He not be greater than both subject and object? And must He not be above and beyond the relative? Must He not live and move and have His being in the absolute? And, if so, how can even He save me and the world to which I belong except He come into the relative and in some way identify Himself with it and partake of its limitations and sorrows? Can the "I", the ego, myself, with its threefold consciousness of the world and self and God, ever get so free from itself, myself, and so into unity with God that in the knowledge of Him and in the love of Him, I shall come to a real knowledge of what I really am and may possibly become. What am I? Who am I? Whence came I? And whither am I going? Pertinent questions surely. And what has the world's best philosophy to say in reply? Nothing, absolutely nothing that is worth saying, except it be by way of mental recreation.

Now, please, let us note two things: All these questions and more are involved in the searching interrogation of this Young Ruler. There is nothing there that is not here. There is vastly more here than there. Second, the only one to whom any man can go, if he is to have an answer which will satisfy, is the One to whom this young man went. The French philosopher said, "I think, therefore I am." And where did that lead him? But a far greater than he said and he said it with profound humility, "what I am, I am by the grace of God." And where did this lead the Apostle of the Gentiles? It was he who said again, "For me to live is Christ." Yes the "I am" of the Christ of God, or continue in bondage to the elements of the world. Thus only can the real truth of personality be found and preserved.

What must I do?

But this question holds in its bosom another; namely, "What must I not do?" And bound up with these two inseparable interrogations there are profound implications and suggestions as to moral possibility, opportunity, responsibility and inevitable final accountability. The positive implies the negative, and vice versa. And in threading my way between the two, so as not to err to the right or the left, I cry out in conscious helplessness, "Who is sufficient for these things in a world like this?" In view of these facts how true are the words of the Master: Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto the life, and few there are that find it.

Considering human nature as it is we need not be surprised that the Young Ruler turned back after he had made such a splendid effort to enter in. The commentators who denounce this young man, and have themselves vastly less to lose in order to enter, do not realize that where he was after "the great refusal" is exactly where they, for the most part, are now-outside the

Messianic Kingdom. We sympathize with the young man because for many years we have been seeking to get this question experimentally answered; and so far we can only say with Paul, "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before I press towards the Mark for the Prize." Yes, the young man was not after salvation, but after the "prize." We will see by and by exactly what this is.

Salvation is won by BELIEVING, but the prize by DOING. Salvation is dual in the Scriptures. [Salvation is] first from the guilt of sin; and, second from the power of sin. Every believer has the former, but this by no means implies that he will ever possess the latter. Only those who endure unto the end will have salvation in the second degree (Matt. 24:13). And if those who do not endure unto the end miss the second stage of salvation, what will be the consequence, the penalty? They will lose the Messianic Kingdom for the bliss and glory of which the Young Ruler was longing, being impelled in some degree by the spirit that moved the heart of the "father of the faithful"; but he found himself unable to "walk in the steps of that faith of his father Abraham which he had being yet uncircumcised" (Rom. 4:12). Who of us has not failed in this same walk?

Jesus said to His disciples: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (John 13:17). The word here translated "do" is one of the greatest in the New Testament, occurring nearly 600 times; and is translated by many different English words. Until a man is born from above he cannot do any works acceptable to God.

Salvation in the first degree is wholly by faith, faith in the works of another, even Christ the Redeemer. But after faith has come and the foundation of Christianity is laid deep in the spirit of man, not merely in his soul, all progress is conditioned by works of faith and love. The new life must find expression in acts of obedience, long suffering, and also in daring deeds of valor in the great conflict with the powers of darkness. Relatively speaking, the Reformers placed altogether too much emphasis on justification, and too little on sanctification. This defect continues until the present day in all the Reformed Churches. They seem only to have seen salvation in the first degree. When Christ comes and believers stand before the Bema (2 Cor. 5:10) the judgment will proceed, not on the basis of faith, but of works as the only adequate proof of faith (Rev. 22:12). Referring to the second degree of salvation as the condition of entering the Messianic Kingdom, James says, "Can faith save him?" implying that it cannot (see Matt. 7:13, 14 and Luke 21:36). But Christians who fail in good works generally excel in evil works. The result is judgment (Luke 13:23-30; John 5:29). The traditional eschatology applies this latter passage exclusively to unsaved sinners, but we will prove later that this is another gratuitous

assumption based on the misinterpretation of the narrative with which we are now dealing.

What shall I do to INHERIT eternal life?

A very superficial examination of the three scriptural words, “inherit”, “inheritance”, and “inheritor”, indicates that they are all family words. They are never applied to a person who is yet outside the pale of salvation. Did Christ rebuke the Young Ruler for his use of this family word? By no means! Then did He not thereby virtually admit that the questioner was acting within the limit of his rights as a son of Abraham?

The very first time the word *inherit* occurs in the Bible, it has specific reference to the coming Messianic Kingdom.

> ***“And he, Abraham, believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness. And He said unto him, I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldeans, to give thee this land to inherit it. And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?”*** (Gen. 15:1-18)

When a man is born again he becomes an heir; but heirs do not inherit till they come of age (Gal. 4:1-2). But even before that time he may disinherit himself by misconduct. Only those who by spiritual growth pass out of the imperfection of childhood and grow up into Christ in all things will be able to establish their claim to the inheritance. Once the children of Israel came under the Blood of the Passover Lamb in Egypt they became heirs of all the wealth of the Land of Promise; but of the number over twenty years of age only Joshua and Caleb entered in. In Hebrews 3 and 4 the Holy Spirit applies this to the Church and shows that the peril of believers then, is the peril of believers today. The Young Ruler saw his danger, and in this he differs widely from those who denounce him as a legalist. Listen to the solemn words of Paul:

> ***“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified”*** (Acts 20:32).

The words, “are sanctified,” ought to read, “have been sanctified.” The Corinthians were sanctified in Christ judicially, but in themselves, actually, they were carnal, mere babes in Christ, and as such they had no title to the inheritance; and Paul was honest enough to tell them so in the most explicit terms (2 Cor. 12:19-21; compare Gal. 5:19-21). Morally and spiritually, relative to their dispensational standing, the Young Ruler was on a much higher level than either the Corinthians or the Galatians, and there is no room for doubt that they were saved in the first degree.

What shall I do to inherit ETERNAL LIFE?

Owing to the fact that "Eternal Life" is the subject of the second chapter of the book we will only touch on the matter very briefly here. We have shown, and it is generally admitted, that the word salvation has a dual, or two-fold meaning in the Bible. Namely, as exhibited in justification and sanctification; that is, in deliverance from the guilt of sin, and deliverance from the power of sin. But while this fact has been generally admitted, there has been, and is, an implied assumption that wherever the former has been made good the latter must follow as a matter of consequence. This is a most fatal error, as millions of the redeemed who have passed over the lines know today to their sorrow and irreparable loss.

The Westminster Standards are very misleading in their teaching in this respect. Question 37 in the Shorter Catechism asks;

> ***Q. What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death?***
> ***A. The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory.***

As we will prove in the next chapter there is absolutely no warrant in the Bible for any such teaching. The same theory, however, is held by most evangelical teachers of the present day.

Martin Luther injected deadly poison into the veins of the German, or Lutheran Church, the results of which are in such pathetic evidence in the war now being waged in Europe. He says:

> ***"It is therefore as absurd and unsuitable that they, the righteous, should do good works, as if they were to say God should do good, the sun should shine, the pear-tree should bring forth pears three and seven should make ten, as all this ensues of necessity of the case from the nature of the thing."***

Thus Martin Luther negates the very essence of the teaching of Jesus Christ as when He said **"**If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them**."** (John 13:17). In the light of the above extract it is easy to see why Luther disliked the Epistle of James, calling it an "Epistle of straw."

The expression "kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God" is also very common in Scripture. This also is dual. In Matthew 13 the kingdom of heaven is spoken in seven parables, and every time it refers to Christendom in the present dispensation, or age. But in passages like Matt. 18:3, it has reference to the Messianic Kingdom in the age to come when Christ through restored Israel will reign over all the nations in the world. The failure to observe this important distinction is a source of deplorable confusion in Bible study and teaching.

But until that memorable morning in December 1913, I never dreamed that the phrase "Eternal Life" was dual. That blessed ray of illumination made

me to know it, and diligent examination of the Word confirmed it. This is what I mean by "The Dualism of Eternal Life." We will therefore for the present postpone the examination of these words till the next chapter. And though this is the strongest argument we have to present in opposition to the traditional interpretation of our narrative, we trust we shall be able in this chapter, without it, to demonstrate the truth of our position; and in doing so will undermine the foundations of that system of eschatology which has held sway in the churches for hundreds of years. It is because of the momentous issues involved that we are going so slowly and cautiously in our exposition of the narrative in hand.

The reply of Christ to the man's question:

"Why callest thou me good? none *is* good, save one, *that is,* God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother." (Luke 18:19-20).

1. There is in these words no rebuke as to the Young Ruler's conception of what he was wanting, but only as to the substance and mode of his salutation. The Master wanted the seeker to think more deeply and thereby recognize His Divinity in order to deepen his faith and intensify his assurance. This was the stumbling block to the orthodox Jew.
2. Christ in reply to the question proposes something to be done. He knew exactly where His questioner was morally and also spiritually. If the man was unsaved and Jesus knew it, would He not have dealt with him accordingly? But if, on the other hand, the man was saved, and was sincerely desirous to qualify for a place in the Messianic Kingdom; and that qualification could only be secured by holiness of life, by deeds of righteousness, by deep self denial, what better answer could Jesus have given than the one before us? According to the traditional theory a man can have salvation, and break every one of the commandments enumerated by the Savior, and yet enter the millennial kingdom, because, they say, it is all of grace. But Galatians 5:19-21 and 2 Corinthians 12:19-21, not to cite other passages, prove the falsity of the assumption. Listen to the testimony of the Holy Spirit: "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws" (Gen. 26:5). "Showing mercy to thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments" (Ex. 20:6). "If ye love me keep my commandments" (John 14:15). "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them he it is that loveth Me" (John 14:21). "And whatsoever we ask we receive of Him, because we keep His commandments and do those things that are pleasing in His sight" (1 John 3:22). "Blessed are they that do His

commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gates into the City" (Rev. 22:14). There is no getting away from the fact that in the traditional interpretation of Christianity there is a vast amount of downright Antinomianism. We would not belittle the Reformation. It was a magnificent work of God's Spirit. But it stopped short of the goal. The order of the kingdom as to growth is, "**First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.**[2]"[Mark 4:26-29] This is the order both for the individual and the Church. The Reformation stopped in the ear, hence the estimate of Christ in His judgment of Sardis which is a type of the Reformed Churches (Rev. 3:1-6). To illustrate our point we will take one brief quotation from Martin Luther in his commentary on the Galatians. He says: ***"Good works ought to be done; the example of Christ ought to be followed-Well, all these things will I gladly do. What then followeth? Thou shalt then be saved and obtain everlasting life? Nay, not so. I grant indeed that I ought to do good works, patiently suffer troubles and afflictions, and to shed my blood also, if need be, for the cause of Christ; and yet am I not justified, neither do I obtain salvation thereby."*** As to salvation in the second degree this teaching is totally unscriptural. But there are some exceptions to this scene of ruin and spiritual desolation, and so the Holy Spirit adds: "Thou has a few names in Sardis which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with Me in white, for they are worthy" (Rev. 3:1-5). Believers become worthy only by good works wrought through faith and love (Rom. 4:12; Luke 20:35; Rev. 19:7; Phil. 2:12-13).

3. Christ says to the Young Ruler, "If thou desirest to enter into The Life, keep the commandments" (Matt. 19:17). Notice the definite article before life. Both the Authorized Version and Revised Version have overlooked the distinctive significance of this little word in their translations. As will be shown later this is a very common error on their part. If the Savior had said, "If thou wilt enter into life", the reference might have been to life in regeneration; that is, to salvation in the first degree; but when He inserted the article it is quite evident

---

[2] The Kingdom of our dear LORD has a "trinity of fulfillment" in three stages, phases, parts or dominions; typified, initially by Moses giving the Law and setting up the Tabernacle, Joshua leading the Chosen into the Promised Land and Solomon building the Temple. Also in the three anointings of King David, the three agriculture-related pilgrimage festivals of Israel, and culminating in the three resurrections. This is realized in the offices of our founding Prophet, presiding High Priest and soon to return conquering King of kings: the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The Angel of His presence, the Holy Ghost, officiating as Comforter, Guide and Witness Authorizing each local church unit comprizing the present kingdom stage. [Ge9:27; Ex23:14-17; 1Sa16:13; 2Sa2:4; 5:3; Pro9:10; Ecc3:1; Isa2:1-4; 26:19; 61:1; 63:7-10; Eze47:1-4; Dan9:24; Mt3:10-13; 13:33; 16:16-19; 18:17-20; 27:51-54; 28:18-20; Mk4:26-29; Jo1:31-34; 3:3-8; 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7; 20:20-23; Ac1:5-8; 2:1-4,14-42; 8:14-17; 10:44-48; 15:7-8,14-17; 1Co12:11-14; 15:20-28; Ga4:26-27; Eph1:3-6; 2:6,19-22; Phi3:20-21; Col1:13; 1Th4:14-17; He9:23-28; 12:22-25; 13:10-16; Ja5:7-8; 2Pe1:11; 1Jo2:20,27; 5:6-9; Re14:14-19; 20:1-15]

that He had in mind full deliverance from the power of sin and entrance into the Life more abundant which in John He declared He came to impart to all those who will fulfill the conditions; and thus follow Him all the way (John 10:9-11; 15:9 and Luke 9:23; 21:36).

4. He is commanded to love his neighbor as himself (Matt. 19:19). This sums up all the commands in the second table of the Decalogue. It is the Golden Rule. Note as follows:

- This command is a New Testament precept.
- No unsaved man can possibly keep so holy a command. The fact that Christ required of him such a high standard implies grace in the man's heart, but not enough to carry him through. There are two words in the Greek for love in both the verbal and the noun forms: agapaō and phileō. The former is much the stronger word and it is this the Savior makes use of in His command to the Seeker after the deeper Life. When Jesus said to Peter, "Lovest thou Me", He used agapaō, but when Peter replied, "Thou knowest that I love Thee", he was careful to use phileō.
- How many Christians today love their neighbor as themselves? Why apply a test of character to this young man, whom they regard as unsaved, which they will not apply to themselves as saved. If living out the Golden Rule is to be the standard, not one out of a thousand can be saved even in the first degree. How absurd then to apply that rule to a man who is an utter stranger to grace as this man in the narrative is supposed to be. The Golden Rule means DOING, and only a really well saved man can do after this fashion.

The Young Ruler assures the Master that so he has kept the commandments. "All these have I kept from my youth up."

1. This man must have been honest and truthful; for if he had lied the Master would have known it and have charged him so. The absence of any rebuke is proof that what he said was true. Let it also be borne in mind that under the Law the human heart was not searched as under the Gospel. Jesus was seeking to carry the young man over from the Old order to the New, and so dealt with him gently. No man ever was saved in the primary sense by keeping the law. Jesus, therefore, only required relatively perfect obedience to its demands even in His own people.
2. The Young Ruler shows his modesty in that when Christ said, "If thou wilt enter into the life, keep the commandments." He used for KEEP the strong word tereō, but when the Ruler made reply he used the milder word phulassō. That is, he means to say that he has been guarded on all these points; but would not deny that at times he had failed in his fidelity. Surely this is the mark of a sincere, truth-loving

soul; a man of real humility; in short, a saved man, a man who was pressing towards the goal amid many temptations to draw back; for his high position both in Church and State must have brought him into trying situations. Nevertheless, on the whole, he had preserved his integrity.

The enquirer's second question: What Lack I Yet?

He was positive after years of watchfulness and study of the coming Kingdom and its glory, that he had some of the qualifications requisite to enter. On the other hand he was not fully satisfied. His heart was not completely at rest. He did not have the full assurance of Faith. Psalm 15 sets forth the qualification of those who would share the glory of the Millennial Kingdom when Jesus comes. Let any man who knows he has salvation in the first degree read that Psalm honestly and with a heart open to the truth and he will most assuredly realize that there is still something lacking.

The second reply of the Master.

> Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go *and* sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come *and* follow me. Matthew 19:21.
>
> Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. Mark 10:21

Let us examine these touching words very carefully.

Note:

1. Jesus beholding him loved him. Was this the love of pity for a lost sinner yet in his sins? Not by any means. It was the love of appreciation, of admiration. The Savior saw wonderful possibilities in this Young Ruler. Possibilities not merely for the young man, but for Himself as well. His great heart longs for the companionship of those with whom He can enter into full friendship and fellowship (read John 17, and the Song of Solomon). "He loved him." It is the very word used in John 11:5. "Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus". It is only said five times in the Four Gospels that Jesus, using the verb agapaō, loved certain individuals. They are John the Evangelist, Martha, her sister and Lazarus, and the subject of our narrative. It is also said of the apostolic body when Jesus washed their feet (John 13:1). The expression "His own" would exclude Judas. Now it is certain that John and the other ten apostles were saved, Martha and her sister and Lazarus were saved. Why exclude the Young Ruler from the class in which the Holy Spirit places him without specific

evidence to the contrary? But if we examine Mark 10:21 and John 11:5 we find that while the verb is the same the mood is different; and in this there is profound significance. In the latter the tense is imperfect and might be translated, Jesus was loving Martha, and her sister and Lazarus. But in the case of the Young Ruler the verb is in the aorist tense, and indicates an act, in this case, begun and ended. Thus he lost the opportunity of his life (see John 14:21-23). So far as the blessedness of the age to come is concerned, he lost his soul (Matt. 10:32-39). Deliverance from this condition of self-centeredness is the Great Salvation provided for every believer who is willing to become wholly centered in Christ (Heb. 2:1-3). This is the secret of fruit-bearing (John 15:1-10).

2. If thou desirest to be PERFECT.

Here we have another key word. We cannot think without words. But even with them we are continually exposed to danger unless we attend closely to our definitions. This is necessary, not only because different words have different meanings, but the same word has different meanings in different connections. These difficulties are of themselves sufficient to tax the resources of a really honest soul if that were all. But the perplexity of the problem of Bible interpretation is intensified a hundredfold by defective and even false translations. These facts show how in the very nature of things there must be few real teachers. Few have the time needed; fewer have the natural gifts and intellectual acquirements; and fewer still have that love of God and His Word, written and living, which must ever lie at the basis of the whole process.

The word here translated *perfect* is misleading, since to most minds it conveys the idea of sinlessness, which in its application to any but Christ it never means.

The word is telos, an end, or the end. It answers excellently in the connection to our English word goal. If thou desirest to reach the goal, do so and so. The special point to be noted is that, in the estimation of the Young Ruler and of the Master also, the questioner has long ago entered the race; the starting point has been left far in the rear; but the goal has not been reached, and there are many difficulties in the way. It is not implied that the act of parting with his great wealth would of itself decide the contest in his favor. But it would remove a very great hindrance, an almost insuperable barrier, to the successful prosecution of the race.

It is a fact that telos is never once applied in the New Testament to an unbeliever, or to a sinner seeking salvation. Let us take a few examples:

- "Be ye therefore *perfect,* even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48).

- "But when that which is *perfect* is come, then that which is in part shall be done away" (1 Cor. 13:10).
- "Let us therefore, as many as be *perfect,* be thus minded, and if in anything ye he otherwise minded. God shall reveal even this unto you" (Phil. 3:15).
- "That we may present every man *perfect* in Christ Jesus" (Col. 1:28).
- "Let patience have her *perfect* work" (James 1:4).
- "*Perfect* love casteth out fear" (1 John 4:18).

Neither is it anywhere implied that when a state of such perfection is reached no further progress is possible, or desirable. When a young man has reached twenty one years of age he may be said to have attained to the telos, to maturity, the goal, so far as the state of perfection is concerned; but he may make great progress in that state. The application to our present study is surely apparent to all unprejudiced minds. If the Young Ruler had had the courage, the faith, the grace, to lay all his wealth at the feet of the Master just then; he would by that act have entered the "state" of perfection. In the light of the Sermon on the Mount how few Christians ever enter this holy, heavenly state of absolute surrender? The believer who refuses to give up his unjust profits in business, his worldly companions, is much further, from the Kingdom of God than that young ruler. Let us go on to perfection (Heb. 6:1).

One Thing Thou Lackest.

1. "Go thy way". The Go and the Come are inseparable. There are 44 words in the Bible translated go. The one used here is hupagō. We will note three examples of its use.

"Jesus saith unto her, '*Go* call thy husband and come hither'" (John 4:16).

"Again the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof *goeth* and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field" (Matt. 13:44-46).

"And He said unto him, '*Go,* wash in the pool of Siloam'; he went his way therefore and washed and came seeing" (John 9:7).

The Young Ruler had not found in Christ and His gift the hidden treasure, the pearl of great price; and therefore he had not found himself at a sufficient depth in order to realize how profoundly self-centered he was, He who would find himself must first find the Christ. And he who has really found the Christ has already found himself (read Acts 9). There is no way out of self into Christ, but that of self-denial and self-sacrifice. In proportion as one goes out of himself and into Christ he objectifies the self, the fallen nature, and is thus enabled to distinguish between it and the true ego. It is only thus that a man can come to really hate his own life, his own self, and yield to God in absolute surrender (Luke 14:25-35). This truth

would revolutionize current psychology if only it could be seen and believed; and the reflex effect on theology and anthropology would be most beneficent.

The attitude of the Young Ruler to the world and to his fellow men was not just right. To “Go” and make it right, was the condition of getting right with God at that deeper depth of his being which would constitute his essential qualification for entering the kingdom.

2. Go Thy Way, Sell Whatsoever Thou Hast, And Give To The Poor.

“Whatsoever thou hast”. That left him nothing. Much grace is needed even today to meet such an ordeal. How absurd to expect an unsaved sinner to meet such a drastic requirement. Why sinners should be expected to do what is experimentally impossible to 999 saints out of every 1000 even in this dispensation of grace?

“**Sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor**”. WHY?

(a) To test and prove his faith. Very good.
(b) To indicate the infinite superiority of the things of God over the things of this world. Very good also. But you have not yet touched the heart of the problem.
(c) There were many poor in those days and their needs were many. That is also to the point.
(d) The poor were poor because he was rich. Their misfortune was his opportunity. That’s it.

The civil law sanctioned his method of acquiring and retaining what was not really his by the Law of Moses, that is, of God. When the children of Israel entered Canaan every family had its portion of land; and the landmarks were for a time scrupulously observed. There were no owners of large estates until the economic system established by God had been thrust to one side by inhuman and godless rapacity (Num. 27:1-11).

Mark says he had great possessions (ktēmata polla). This word ktēmata specifically indicates that the Young Ruler’s wealth was in landed estates. What according to Moses should have been divided amongst thousands of people had passed by wicked legislation into the hand of one aristocratic family to which this young man had become the legal heir. He had sinned grievously, though unconsciously, against his fellow men. This is why all the commands enumerated by the Master belonged to the Second Table of the Decalogue. Christ had said, “Thou shalt not steal” and he thought he had really kept that command. The fundamental reason of the difficulty rich men have in entering the kingdom, in its secondary sense, lies in the fact that they as a rule get their wealth dishonestly. Then as it accumulates they more and more set their hearts on it, trust in it, and make it their God.

3. THOU SHALT HAVE TREASURE IN HEAVEN.

It is impossible for any man except by the grace of God given in very rich measure to lay up treasure in heaven and on earth at the same time. But it is possible with God. If God could get a man of wealth honestly acquired, wholly surrendered to Him, so as to trust Him absolutely, and throw all "the tricks of the trade" to the wind, there is no telling what might be accomplished. If rich men who are Christians could only see that God hates robbery for burnt offering; and that all such only increase their guilt; and if they could see that after being delivered from the guilt of sin they are by their unholy methods exposing themselves to fearful suffering during the coming age, they might in many cases be turned from the broad to the narrow way (Matt. 7:13-14).

How blessed that we can during this brief probation on earth lay up treasure in heaven. Every kind act and loving deed done in the Name of Jesus will be remembered and rewarded. But where the great sacrifice is withheld such deeds coming forth a true heart of love even on a small scale, are not easy (Rom. 12:1-2).

4. TAKE UP THY CROSS AND FOLLOW ME.

This is a very, very, difficult requirement. Very few Christians do it. Such a demand is never made of unbelievers; that is, of unsaved sinners. It means scorn and contempt and persecution. Those who do so are strangers and pilgrims in the earth (1 Peter 2:11). But they look for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God (Heb. 11:9-10).

It is very probable that Christ's call to this young man would have resulted, if accepted, in his becoming a herald of salvation; and he might have left behind him a record similar to that of Philip, or Barnabas, or even Paul. Contrast our Narrative with Phil. 3:7-14.

"THE GREAT REFUSAL."

This is what Dante called it (see Farrer's *Life of Christ).* "And when he heard this he went away very sorrowful; for he was very rich". This supreme moment comes to every believer when it is forever decided whether or not he is to share the inconceivable glory of the coming Messianic Kingdom (1 Cor. 2:9-10). Indeed, there are two crisis moments: the first when salvation in the first degree is accepted or rejected; and the other when salvation in the second degree is at stake. Millions have come under the blood in Egypt (type of the world) and have crossed the Red Sea (type of the baptism of separation (Rom. 6:3-5), but they have not entered the Land of Promise; they died in the wilderness (Rom. 8:13-14). The type and antitype agree perfectly. How few of the saved will be found in possession of the wedding garment (Matt. 22:1-14, and Heb. 12:14). The Master's Comment:

"And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, He said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God. For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God" (Luke 18:24-25). "How hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God" (Mark 10:24).

Weymouth's translation here is very vivid: Jesus saw his sorrow and said, "With how hard a struggle do the possessors of riches ever enter the Kingdom of God". ***Note: if there is one truth that lies right out on the surface of the Bible it is this, that salvation from the guilt of sin, salvation in the first degree, is by faith apart from works because it is a gift, and the idea of struggling for this is utterly foreign to the whole scheme of redemption.*** This is perfectly true both of the type and the antitype. Look at the type. What had Israel to do when the destroying Angel was about to pass over Egypt? Simply to slay the Passover Lamb, sprinkle the blood on the two side posts and on the upper door post; then go inside and feast on the lamb roast with fire (Ex. 12:1-14). Surely that did not require any effort, or struggling. What could be easier, or simpler? But that was only salvation in the first degree. When, however, they crossed the Red Sea, and went three days journey into the wilderness all was changed. The wilderness life brought indwelling sin to the surface. This was God's purpose that He might show them how wicked their hearts were and lead them to throw themselves on Him for every need. But instead of humbling themselves and keeping in mind the almighty power of God, their Jehovah, they fell to murmuring and wanted to return to Egypt, and to their old bondage (Ex. 14:1-26). Their real difficulty and danger was not in the lack of water and bread, but in the unbelief of their wicked hearts, for God was abundantly able and willing to meet their need. But they must be tried, and the trial proved the unfit to enter the Land of Promise. Compare Numbers 14:1-45. They, though saved in the first degree, perished in the wilderness. Now turn to the antitype, 1 Corinthians 10:1-10.

> ***"But with most of them God was not well pleased for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things".***

Surely the moral of this is not difficult to apprehend.

The keeper of the prison at Philippi said to Paul and Silas "***Sirs, what must I do to be saved?***" And they said, "***Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house.***" The keeper of the prison did as they taught him with the result that right there and then, without any struggling, he was saved. That was salvation in the first degree. He had now in him the germ of the coming Kingdom, and to develop that seed of life he must make an open confession of Christ; he

must cut with the fashionable society of the City; he had to stand for truth and righteousness as revealed in the Scriptures. Is it not likely, yea certain, that he met with persecution, and perhaps lost his position in the government? This no doubt seemed hard, but Paul had shown him that this is the way into the kingdom. Then also, as now, the wilderness life as in the case of Israel brought out the enmity of the flesh to God and His will; and men came to realize how depraved they were by nature, and how they needed deliverance from the evil of their own hearts more than from the external evils in the world about them. The overcoming life brings freedom from the power of indwelling sin, from the fear of men, and gives entrance to the Messianic Kingdom. Yes, indeed, ***"we must through much tribulation enter into the Kingdom of God"*** (Acts 14:22; Rev. 3:21). There is no path but this (Matt. 7:13-14). Oh, that preachers and Christians generally could see this truth! Then they would also see that they are in the same place of peril as the Young Ruler whom they now think to be a mere legalist. How delusive is the power of established custom and how fatal.

How HARD IT IS FOR THEM THAT TRUST IN RICHES TO ENTER THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The Kingdom of Heaven and The Kingdom of God are used interchangeably. This does not imply that in every respect they are absolutely identical. How shall we understand the phrase? It is customary for postmillenarianism to identify the Kingdom of God and the Church. This is a very great error and is productive of infinite confusion. Postmillenarianism believe and teach that Christ will not come till the end of the world, as they say; and that He is now reigning as King; that He will never come back to found a Kingdom on earth over which He will rule in person; that none will be raised from the dead till the end of the world, and that saved and unsaved will all be judged at the same time. Premillennialism takes the opposite position all along the line. The former have to admit that the latter was the teaching of the Church for at least the first 250 years of her existence.

We will not now discuss the Kingdom of Heaven, or of God, any more than to say that the new birth (John 3:3-5) does not introduce a man to the Kingdom in the sense in which the term is used in our narrative. Why is it so difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom?

1. Because he usually acquires his riches by means of unjust laws and by oppression of the poor.
2. Because such sins cannot be righted by mere confession. There must be restitution in order to get right with God or man.
3. Because the rich cannot learn the lesson of perfect trust.

CHRIST'S TEACHING CREATES ASTONISHMENT.

"When His disciples heard it they said, 'Who then can be saved?'"

Why were they astonished? Because they had been under the false impression that as soon as Messiah came and set up the Kingdom all sincere Jews would enter simply because they were sons of Abraham. This is the very mistake, in substance, made by Christians today. The dualistic content of salvation is as apparent in the Jewish dispensation as in the Christian, if only we come to the word of God with an open mind. The heroes mentioned in Hebrews 11 are not average believers of Old Testament times. They are samples of the overcomers of those pre-Christian ages. The writer says:

"And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise (of the Kingdom); God having provided some better thing concerning us that apart from us they should not be made perfect" (Heb. 11:39-40).

The "us" of the last clause are the overcomers of the present dispensation, those who have gone unto perfection, the goal, the telos. See Phil. 3:7-14; Matt. 24:13 and Heb. 6:1-3. Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31 present the judgment of God on believers who apostatize and go into a state of permanent disobedience to God and conformity to the world. They will be excluded from the Messianic Kingdom, but some time during, or at the end of the Millennium, they will be restored, having paid the very last mite (Matt. 5:25-26). Here again type and antitype are in perfect accord. This is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews as a whole. Read especially Chapters 3 and 4, and Num. 14. Is it any wonder that the Young Ruler was anxious? And is it not astonishing that believers are now so indifferent to the Great Salvation (Heb. 2:1-3)? The first stage of salvation is easy because it is by faith regardless of past conduct (John 4:1-29); but the second is very difficult because it is altogether a matter of character (Rev. 14:1-5; 1 Cor. 13:1-13; Rev. 3:4).

But why did the disciples generalize what the Master had apparently specialized? They saw the young man go away very sorrowful because he was very rich, and could not make the sacrifice. Why should they express surprise when they were so poor, and the majority of the followers of the Christ were so poor, and bound to be so? There was a reason. The record says, as already pointed out, the young man had "great possessions"—ktēmata polla. But when the Master said, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God", He used a different word, namely, chrēmata in dative plural with the article (tois chrēmasin). This is very instructive and explains the astonishment of the disciples; for while the term ktēmata has special reference to property in land and real estate generally, chrēmata is wealth, riches, in any shape or form. Presumably it

may include those physical, intellectual, and vocal qualities in which men trust and by means of which they press to the front in the rivalry of the world. The article differentiates between the riches of this age and the ages to come. How hardly shall they that trust in the riches (of the world) enter into the Kingdom of God? But Jesus assures them that with God even this is possible. God's Word and Spirit are able to break the strongest fetters the Devil can forge and apply, if only the person will let go and yield to His Divine operation, not otherwise.

Peter's interest and curiosity are aroused. Thank God for Peter. His pertinent interrogation points have given us some things that are very precious and which might not otherwise have been known. He, in this case, interjects two declarations with a timely interrogation:

> ***"Behold we have left all" • • • "And have followed Thee"***
> ***"What shall we have, therefore?"***

How many Christians can sincerely go before God today and say to their Savior individually. Behold I have forsaken all and have followed Thee? And if they cannot say it what claim have they to the glory of the age to come any more than this aristocratic but honest young Jew? They say that our Savior does not treat all who come to Him as He did the young man of our narrative. Why not? If God is no respecter of persons when it is a question of entering in at the first gate why should He become such when it is a question of entering in at the second gate? All Israelites could freely enter into the Court of the Tabernacle by a door thirty feet wide; but only the Priests could enter the narrow door into the Holy Place, and not even then unless they had first washed their hands and feet in the Layer at the entrance. Compare Ex. 30:20-21; Rom. 8:13; John 13:8; Heb. 12:14.

Bengel draws a contrast between Christ's treatment of the Rich Young Ruler and Zacchaeus, also a rich man, in the next chapter (Luke 19:1). The tax gatherer offered half his goods to the poor and the Master seemed quite satisfied with the offering and especially because of its voluntary character. From this Bengel assumes that Christ's demand on the Ruler was something special and in no way a general law of the Kingdom. But he overlooks the significant fact that Zacchaeus raised no question concerning his prospects for a place in the coming Messianic Kingdom. Thus the two cases are not at all parallel. The Ruler was running in the race for the prize, while Zacchaeus was after the free gift. This is plain from Luke 19:9-10. The inflexible demand of Christ for all who would enter the Kingdom when He comes is stated in such Scriptures as Luke 9:23; 14:25-35; 13:24; John 14:21-23.

Every believer is in Christ, eternally so, but we have overlooked the fact that in Christ, the True Tabernacle, there is an Outer-Court, a Holy Place, and a Holiest of all. All the saved in the first degree have access to the

Outer-Court in Christ, but only those who enter the School of Christ, who forsake all, and become actual disciples can advance beyond that. And the conditions of discipleship are very severe (Luke 14:25-35). The word, mathetēs (disciples) comes from the verb manthanō, to learn. The mental activity involved in this kind of learning is merely preliminary and formal. The essential factors are volitional and affectional; and the process is inseparable from suffering. "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered" (Heb. 5:8). The Young Ruler is not alone in his failure to enter the School of the Christ. The way into the Holiest is very narrow. All believers are priests potentially, just as they are all sons potentially; but none become priests, or sons, actually, till through the Divine discipline they have passed through the narrow door leading to the Holy Place (Mal. 3:1-3; Rom. 8:13-14; 2 Tim. 2:10-13). To refuse, in this dispensation of the Spirit, to pass on from the Outer-Court in Christ, to the Holy Place, and thence to the Holiest in Christ, is a greater sin than it was for the children of Israel to refuse to enter Canaan and possess their inheritance. The results will be even more serious (Numbers 13; 14; Heb. 3; 4; Gal. 5:19-21). The way in now, as then, is by works as the only sufficient evidence of faith and love. The faith and love that forsake all and follow Jesus (Luke 9:23; Psalm 45:10-11; Rev. 19:7).

"Behold we have left all and have followed Thee". Both verbs are in the aorist tense and denote definite action taken at a given and known time in the past, and the effect continuing up to the moment of speaking. But while this was true of the twelve (eleven) it was not true of all His professed disciples (John 6:66, 69). It is by actual tests in hard places that the Master proves who are and who are not true disciples, and who shall enter the Kingdom at His Coming.

WHAT SHALL WE HAVE THEREFORE?

Peter not only put that question for the twelve, but for you and me. What shall I have in that Day of Days? Jesus said to the Ruler, "Thou shalt have treasure in heaven". But there were conditions—a go sell–and-come follow Me. "The children of this world are wiser than the children of light", because they know how to lay up treasure in this age far better than the latter do for the age to come. But we shall assuredly reap as we sown. No law is surer than this.

Comparison of the Young Ruler and Peter:

(a) They are both saved.

(b) Their questions were equally acceptable to the Master.

(c) In both cases the basis of their hope and interest lay in the Old Testament prophecies concerning the coming Messianic Kingdom.

(d) Neither of them had a clear conception of the nature of the Kingdom, or of the time and manner of its introduction.

(e) Both earnestly desired to enter and participate in its joy.

(f) Both realized that the Master was able to give the desired instruction, and lead in the way thereto.

(g) They both hungered and thirsted after righteousness.

Points of Contrast:

(a) Peter was a poor man, relatively, while the young Ruler was rich.

(b) Peter found it comparatively easy to forsake his little all and follow the Master. With the Ruler it was not only difficult but impossible.

(c) With Peter the higher motive ruled, and in the Ruler the lower. It was not so in everything; just in this one thing; but failure here was disastrous.

(d) With the Ruler it was Jesus plus material goods, but with Peter Jesus was all and in all (John 6:68).

(e) Under the supreme test the Ruler broke down irrecoverably; while under what was to Peter the supreme test he broke down but recovered himself (Matt. 26:69-75).

(f) Peter had in his heart something the Ruler did not have. He could say, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. The other could only say, Good Master.

(g) Peter will have a place in the Messianic Kingdom while the Ruler will be excluded. But may he not have returned and complied with the Master's request?

A double query: If the circumstances of birth, early education, and general environment, had been reversed, and Peter had been rich and the other poor, would Peter have acted as he did? Will God take note of these things in the Day of Judgment? Surely!

The reply of Jesus to Peter's question:

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily, I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for My Name's Sake shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life. And many that are first shall be last; and the last first" (Matt. 19:28-30).

"And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife. or children, or lands, for my sake and the Gospel's; but he shall receive an hundred fold now in this time, houses and brethren and sisters, and mothers and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the age to come eternal life. But many that are first shall be last; and the last first" (Mark 10:29-31).

We will examine this mine of natural riches (chrēmata) which is to be exchanged for the riches of the Coming Kingdom.

1. The first fact to be carefully noted is that these riches of the Kingdom are only for those who forsake all and follow Jesus, and keep on following Him to the end of the race. He that endureth to the end shall be saved with the great salvation (Heb. 2:1-3; Matt. 24:13).
2. What has to be given up is all that which is most dear to the natural heart. Naught else will constitute a sufficient demonstration of perfect love to God and man (Mark 12:28-31).
3. The return is an hundred fold in this present time, this dispensation. Young translates Mark 10:29-30 thus: "And Jesus answered and said—who may not receive a hundred fold now, in this present time." That is, all disciples will not receive a full reward, but they may, if they wish to follow Jesus fully (2 John 8). True disciples are the seed sown on good ground and bring forth fruit thirty-fold, sixty-fold, and hundredfold. Who hath ears to hear let him hear.
4. "Shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This governmental power is elsewhere extended to all overcomers (Rev. 3:21).
5. "With persecutions." This is what above all things fallen human nature dislikes. To escape this what will not the average Christian do? To drift with the bewitching current, to receive the plaudits of men, to bask under the sunny smile of the rich and affluent how delightful-to the flesh. But it is the Master Himself who says, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." Yes, "of YOU".
6. In the Regeneration. In the *palingenesia, palin,* anew, or again, and genesis, a begetting, a second birth. What the new or second birth is to man now; that will the *palingenesia* be to the world, the *kosmos,* in the age to come. "The whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for (the coming of Christ and the consequent) manifestation of the Sons of God" (Rom. 8:19-22).
7. "And in the age to come Eternal Life." Matthew puts it, "and shall inherit eternal (everlasting) life."

Christ concludes the narrative with the very solemn words: "But many that are first shall be last and the last first". The Young Ruler was very highly favored in many ways. He had plenty of time to study the prophecies; he was in close touch with the priests and could enquire of them as to the meaning of the promises to Israel; and he was one of the favored few of our race who have had the opportunity to talk with the Great Teacher face to face. But he turned his back on his only Helper and chose the broad way in preference to the narrow.

It is for the candid reader to say whether or not we have established our thesis; namely, that the Young Ruler is not a sinner seeking salvation in the first degree; but a true, yet imperfect, son of Abraham seeking entrance to the coming Messianic Kingdom. If we have succeeded in doing this we have not only found the key to the true interpretation of the narrative; but we have established a principle which affects the whole realm of the traditional eschatology; and proves it to be thoroughly unscriptural. And yet we have left untouched two of the most important facts in the narrative. Namely, "Eternal Life", and the "Kingdom of God". As we proceed with our study the evidence will increase and intensify. May we have grace to lay hold of the precious promise of the Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth.

A CONFIRMATORY COMPARISON.

According to Luke the question asked of Christ by the Young Ruler had been asked once before by a Lawyer (an interpreter of the Mosaic Law); and in this we find ample confirmation of our interpretation:

"And behold a certain Lawyer stood up and made trial of Him, saying, 'Teacher what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' And he said unto him, 'What is written in the law? What readest thou?' And he answering said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself.' And he said unto him, 'Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live'" (Luke 10:25-28).

It is notable that the account of the Rich Ruler is found in all the Synoptical Gospels, but not in John; while the incident of the Lawyer is peculiar to Luke. There is a reason for this. The Synoptics present the human, historical side of the Christ, as the Son of Man; the prominent feature of which is His claim to be the Messiah of Israel as foretold by the Prophets of the O. T.; and the validity of that claim as demonstrated by His genealogy, His works, and His Life; and then the model for holy conduct as the Law demanded. But John presents the Deity of the Christ as the back ground and support of His holy life and marvelous works and Messianic claims. According to the Jewish conception of the Scriptures every Jew who was circumcised and sought to order his life by the Law of Moses was eligible

for a place in the Messianic Kingdom. This was quite correct and approved by Christ. Where they erred was in the false interpretation of the Law and of the Prophecies. They gave much attention to the ceremonial part of the Law, tithing mint, anise, and cumin. But they neglected the weightier matters of the (moral) Law. Hence, the righteous anathema of the Savior (Matt. 23:13-33).

The reply of Abraham to the rich man in Hades proves that in the writings of Moses and the Prophets they had all the light they needed to enable them to distinguish between right and wrong in human conduct (Luke 16:31). In this connection let me point out a significant fact in reference to the relation of the three Synoptic Gospels to the Gospel according to John and the remainder of the N. T. It will be admitted that there is no greater word in the N.T., than “believe” and its cognates. Then here is a point of deep significance: in the three Synoptical Gospels the word occurs about 30 times; in John’s Gospel 90 times; and in the remainder of the N.T., over 100 times. Not only so but this also: In the Synoptical Gospels this important word is not used, prior to the resurrection, in reference to salvation from the guilt of sin, but in reference to a special promise (Luke 1:45); in reference to mighty works (Mark 11:22-24); to healings (Matt. 9:29); and, very especially, in reference to Christ being the Son of David, the Heir to David’s Throne; in short, the King of the Jews (Matt. 2:2; 21:5; 27:11, 29, 37, 42). Here we have the Gospel of the Kingdom, but not the Gospel of the Grace of God for this Gentile Age. But in John’s Gospel and in the rest of the N.T. while Kingdom truth is never absent, it is viewed rather from its celestial side.

Briefly presented the state of the case is this: In the Synoptical Gospels it is taken for granted that the true children of Abraham are already saved and heirs of the Messianic Kingdom, that is of “Eternal Life”, the popular synonym of the Kingdom of God in the Age to come; and that all they had to do to inherit “eternal (age-lasting) life” in Messiah’s Kingdom was to order their lives according to God’s revealed will in the Old Testament (see Ezek. 18:1-18; Psa. 15).

Viewing the matter in this light, as presented in the Synoptical Gospels, we see how natural and proper it was for the Young Ruler to ask Christ what he must do to enter the Messianic Kingdom-the Golden Age of Israel’s Prophets.

That Christ did not expect any honest Jew at that time and under the aspect of truth presented by Mathew, Mark and Luke, to approach Him on any other basis is quite apparent from the cordial reception the young man received and the directions given him.

All this shows how unjust and lacking in discrimination is the traditional interpretation which represents the inquirer as seeking salvation from the guilt of sin, and on this baseless assumption charges him with legalism and

self-righteousness. But for the sake of comparison, or contrast, let us assume that the young man was seeking salvation (as a sinner) by works, and that Christ disapproved of his conduct because of this fact. Granting this we turn to the case of the Lawyer (Luke 10:25-37) for light.

The fact is apparent on the surface that the question asked of the Master by the two men is identically the same: Namely—"What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" What was the Masters reply to the lawyer? Did he reply as did Paul to the keeper of the prison at Philippi? ***"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved"***? Not at all! Neither the Lawyer nor the Ruler asked to be saved in this sense. As honest sons of Abraham they rightly took this for granted and the facts proved in each case that they had considerable grace in their hearts. And in neither case did the Master deny or challenge the validity of the assumption. But if, on the other hand, we put a post-Pentecostal interpretation on the two passages, that is, after the offer of the Kingdom had been withdrawn from the Jews (Matt. 23:37-39), and grant that the Rich Ruler and the Lawyer were seeking salvation in the sense that the Church has usually understood that word, and thus condemn the Ruler for his legalism, we are at the same time bound to censure the Savior for telling the Lawyer to do the very thing we condemn in the Ruler. But this we dare not do. We must either condemn both or justify both. Christ did not condemn either, but counseled them to go forward in the path in which they were already walking, only to go farther and deeper.

When the Lawyer had given the substance of the Moral Law as consisting in love to God and man, the rely of the Master was, "This do and thou shalt live." What did He mean by that? The traditional view supposes that by so doing he would be saved from the guilt of sin and receive the new birth. But if so that would be salvation by works, would it not? Nevertheless that was not Christ's thought. But rather thus: This do and it shall be said of thee as of Zacharias and Elizabeth, "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Law blameless." Luke 1:6; and when you die you will die in the faith (of Messiah's Kingdom, Heb. 11:13); and during your sojourn in the intermediate state, you shall have your place among the living (Matt. 22:31-32), and not among the dead (John 6:49; Rom. 8:13); and then you will be rewarded with a part in the first resurrection (Rev. 20:6; Luke 20:35; 21:36) and shall live in all the restored and perfected powers of your redeemed manhood, and share with the Son of David the glory of His Messianic Reign and Kingdom.

Then when the Lawyer asked, "And who is my neighbor?" there came from the lips of the Master the beautiful story of the traveler who fell among thieves while on his way down from Jerusalem to Jericho. And what a fearful indictment of the religious leaders of that day, and especially of their interpretation of the Scriptures. Spiritually understood the way from Jerusalem to Jericho is still very dangerous, but right there may be found

and illustrated the two ways of Matt. 7:13-14. And what if that “certain man” was the Savior Himself? And if so the Jews were the “thieves” and they too in their leaders played the role of Priest and Levite, while it remained for the despised Samaritan to minister to the Man of Sorrows. Compare Luke 20:9-15; 7:36-38; 23:26.

Thus we conclude that the question that was on the lips of every pious Jew, equally becomes the lips of ever sincere Christian: “What shall I do to inherit eternal (Millennial) life?” And the compassionate Savior has not left us without an answer (Luke 14:25-33; Heb. 12:14; 1 John 3:1-3).

I may remind the reader before we pass on that he ought not to leave this chapter until he has satisfied himself of the radical antagonism between the Premillennial and the Postmillennial conceptions of the Second Coming of Christ. The man who accepts and stands by the latter deliberately puts himself in the power of the great enemy of God and man, and as deliberately defies the Holy Spirit to lead him into the truth. Our narrative of the Young Ruler is only one out of hundreds and even thousands of Scriptures which cannot be understood apart from the Premillennial view of Christ’s Second Advent, His parousia, or personal presence. One of the most notable of these is Rev. 20:1-6. It is the antagonism between truth and error, between righteousness and unrighteousness, between God and Satan. Yet I have no definite assurance that even Premillennialists, generally, will accept my interpretation of the narrative we have been studying. If they reject it they must do so on postmillennial grounds.

In conclusion let us not forget where we are ethically and exegetically: If we have established our thesis we have accomplished two positive ends with certain negative results following by logical implication. Positively, (**1**) we have found the correct interpretation of the narrative of the Rich Young Ruler; and (**2**) we have established a principle of interpretation of universal significance throughout the total length and breadth and height and depth of the Revelation of God in His Holy Word. Our entire outlook on God and Human Destiny is fundamentally transformed. And, on the negative side, we are obliged to infer that the whole body of Reformed Theology is affected, discounted more or less; and the traditional eschatology is demonstrated to be an elusive fabrication, a cruel imposition, a masterpiece of the Prince of the Power of the Air. If the reader has any doubt of this let him resolve by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit to follow the clue still further.

While we believe our argument is conclusive as to the true interpretation of the portion of Scripture under consideration, the reader will remember that we have omitted the testimony of two sections, the evidential value of which is of infinite significance. The first of these is found in the expression “Eternal Life”, and the second in the complimentary conception of the

Messianic-Theocratic Kingdom. The former we will at once proceed to examine in our next chapter.

As the work stands in manuscript form there are seven chapters, the title of the seventh being, “The Covenanted Messianic-Theocratic Kingdom”, but I find it impossible to get the last chapter in without extending the work beyond certain necessary limits. But the argument is not only complete as far as it goes, but also, I believe, unanswerable, so far, at least, as the main contention is concerned. I am hopeful that the seventh chapter will appear before long in another connection.

CHAPTER 2: THE DUALISM OF ETERNAL LIFE.

> ***“In the ordinary branches of human knowledge or enquiry, the judicious questioning of received opinions has been the sign of scientific vitality, the principle of scientific advancement, the very source and root of healthy progress and growth. If medicine had been regulated three hundred years ago by Act of Parliament; if there had been Thirty nine Articles of Physic, and every licensed practitioner had been compelled, under pains and penalties, to compound his drugs by the prescriptions of Henry the Eighth’s physician, Doctor Butts, it is easy to conjecture in what state of health the people of this country would be at present.” Froude’s Essays.***

It is the purpose of this chapter to state, illustrate, enforce, and apply the truth of the “Dualism of Eternal Life” as I find it in the word of God, especially in the New Testament.

By the above heading I mean to convey the thought, the truth, that the phrase “Eternal Life” is used in a dual or twofold sense, in the Scriptures. In the Former it designates the free gift of God to the soul that believes on Jesus Christ as the only Savior from sin. In the second sense it means, no longer the free gift, but the prize of which Paul speaks in Phil. 3:7-14. This prize is the gracious privilege granted to believers who like Joshua and Caleb, like John and Paul, wholly follow the Lord, of sharing in the glory of the first resurrection and the unspeakable blessedness of Christ’s Messianic-Theocratic-Millennial Kingdom in the age to come (Matt. 19:27-30).

The gift of Eternal Life contains potentially the prize; but that potentiality may never be developed in the present period of the believer’s probation; and if such be the case he will miss the Kingdom and its glory in the coming age.

Dualistic combinations run all through the Bible. They take various forms as to moral character. They may be synthetic, or antithetic. In this chapter we emphasize the former. As examples we may take Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca. In the New Testament we have Christ and His Bride; the Spirit and the word; Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Examples of antithetic dualism are found in Abel and Cain, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, the Church and the World, Grace and Law.

There is one special point, under the head of synthetic dualism, where the leaders of the people both in the Jewish and Christian dispensations have, at fearful cost, failed God. This is the grand synthesis of the two advents of Christ. The Jewish outlook on the future saw but one advent of Messiah and that in glory to establish His Kingdom and deliver the children of Abraham from Gentile thralldom. They had no room for a humble, suffering Messiah preparatory to the glory of His Messianic Rule. The Levitical offerings, as well as passages like Isa. 53, ought to have saved them from this error. The Old Testament everywhere presents the Messiah as reaching His throne through suffering (Psalms 22 and 89). So also the people of God in this dispensation have no room for the thought of the same Christ still suffering for the truth's sake in the members of His mystical body. The loss to vital Christianity has been enormous, as carnal Christians will discover to their sorrow when they stand before the judgment seat of Christ. 2 Cor. 5:10.

The Church admits the two advents but so completely disassociates them from their historical and prophetic settings as to rob them of their synthetic beauty, power, and glory; and also of their spiritual and eschatological significance.

Associated with this, and growing out of it, comes the subject of the present volume, where it seems to me the Christian Church has made the greatest mistake in her whole career. This is her failure to recognize and emphasize the "Dualism of Eternal Life" and its corollaries. When the Church lost this truth, so central and vital to both Testaments, I do not know. It is doubtful, however, if the date is later than the third century A. D.

It is perfectly clear to the mind of the writer that our exegesis of Luke 18:18-30, as presented in Chapter 1, has established the fact that the Young Ruler is not a sinner seeking salvation from the guilt of sin, and possession of the free gift of eternal life; but a real son of Abraham seeking how he may be assured of a place in Messiah's coming Kingdom. And it is equally certain that Peter's question and Christ's reply (Matt. 19:27-30) constitute an extension and amplification of the subject introduced by the Ruler. In addition to this Christ's two replies indicate that "**eternal life**" and the "**Kingdom of God**", are here synonymous expressions.

We will now examine closely the two terms in the phrase "eternal life". There are three Greek words in the New Testament all translated in A.V.

and R.V. by one English word, “life”. This is confusing. The three words are *bios, psychē* and *zōē* (with the “o” and “e” long).

[The term] *bios* occurs eleven times in the New Testament. It is especially associated with man’s day, and usually refers to the material or sensuous side of human existence. Thus: “he divided unto them *his* living.” (Luke 15:12; so 2 Tim. 2:4; I John 2:16).

The word *psychē* occurs about one hundred times and is translated life, or soul. It expresses the idea of the natural life in man, and generally with the suggestion of subjection to sin and death. Thus: “If any man will save His life he shall lose it” (see Matt. 16:25; 10:39; Mark 8:35). This term is used to express the thought of the natural life of Christ as laid down in His atoning death (Matt. 20:28). The adjective *aiōnios* (usually translated “eternal” or “everlasting”) is never found in association with *bios* or *psychē.* The reason is that the life expressed by these words is subject to mood, time, and circumstance. And these are the only life which man by nature can know.

The third term is *zōē.* It occurs in the N.T. about one hundred and forty times. In its Divine original it is uncreated and indestructible. It is “that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us” (I John 1:2; John 1:4). This is the life imparted in the new birth. But its latent potentiality can only be developed by the crucifixion of the self-life (*psychē),* and by continual fellowship with Christ as the despised and rejected One; and also as the Victor over sin and death and hell.

This distinction between the soul and the Spirit, and between the *psychē* and the *zōē,* both so fundamental to biblical interpretation, is ignored and virtually denied by modern theology; yes, indeed, and by historical and systematic theology generally.

As a matter of fact this distinction between *psychē* and *zōē* ought to be the primary postulate of all science and philosophy. If it were so science would keep absolutely to its own realm-the investigation of natural phenomena, never daring for a moment to step over the line of demarcation, but ever with bared and bowed head pausing at the boundary line to worship and adore that sacred, awful, personal reality without which and whom the phenomenal world could have no meaning, no purpose, and no existence. So far as Christian Theology has any life in it, and wants to give a reasonable apology for its claim to a hearing, it must contend for this distinction with all its might, and in the full consciousness of its unrivaled dignity and supreme worth. To affirm that Christian Theology has a right to the first place, at the head of every other branch of knowledge, not merely as a matter of classification, but as of organic vitality, unity and worth, is only another way of saying that Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is now *de jure*[3]

---

[3] **de jure** /deɪ ˈjʊəreɪ, di: ˈdʒʊəri/ ▶ adverb- **according to rightful entitlement or claim; by right**. Often contrasted with de facto. ▶ adjective- **existing or holding a specified position by legal right**:

and will soon be *de facto*[4], King of Kings, and Lord of lords before whom every knee in Heaven and earth and hell, will yet bow in absolute subjection. Apart from this great fundamental distinction, and its ethical and spiritual implications, theology ceases to be Christian, becomes the handmaid of rationalistic philosophy and the plaything of ecclesiastical opportunists.

Apostolic Christianity has taken the word *zōē* out of its degraded associations in the literature of heathen Greece, given it a new and heavenly fellowship, infused into it divine energy and given it a central place in the galaxy of Christian verities. For what is love and joy and peace and long suffering—but so many attributes of the substance called life. This life could not be eternal if it were not consubstantial with the Son of God;– nor consubstantial with the Son of God if it were not eternal. But this is not to affirm that matter is eternal.

What I want now to prove is that the phrase, Eternal Life, is used in the Scriptures to convey two quite distinct conceptions. It is (1) the free gift of God to every sinner who sincerely and scripturally accepts Jesus Christ as the Savior from the guilt of sin; and (2) It is used to designate the blessedness of the Millennial Reign of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We will take two passages from the Epistle of Paul to the Romans to illustrate the difference. In Rom. 6:23 it is expressly stated that "**For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**" This is so clear that it needs no comment. In Rom. 5:20-21, we have the following:

> ***"Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin has reigned unto death even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."***

In the former case it is a gift to be had by any sinner for the simple taking, regardless of his past record. Rom. 6:23 comprehends the simple fact that salvation is provided and freely offered. But Rom. 5:21 carries the thought farther. Sin did more than come in. It abounded. Therefore God must meet this and provide a means whereby the reign of grace will overtake and exceed the power of sin and death in every individual who so desires. At the Cross God damned (*katakrinō)* sin in the flesh; and thus Christ having spoiled principalities and powers made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (the Cross; Rom. 8:3; Col. 2:15). How did Christ win this

---

he had been de jure king since his father's death. **– origin** Latin, literally '**of law**'.[Oxford Dictionary of English © Oxford University Press 2010]

[4] **de facto** /deɪ 'faktəʊ, di:/ ▶ adverb- **in fact, whether by right or not**: *the country was de facto divided between two states*. Often contrasted with de jure. ▶ adjective- **existing or holding a specified position in fact but not necessarily by legal right**: *a de facto one-party system*.**– origin** Latin, literally '**of fact**'.[Oxford Dictionary of English © Oxford University Press 2010]

victory? By grace? No, there was no grace for Him. He was made sin for us. He met the demands of the Law to the fullest extent by a life of absolute surrender to God. Thus was grace made possible for sinners? Grace for pardon, and also for deliverance. Grace must do in the individual what sin has been doing, manifesting its power to control and direct the energies of the person. As sin reigned through an unholy life (psychē); so must grace reign through a holy life. (*zōē);* and if it does the reward is "Eternal Life" in the coming Messianic Kingdom; but not otherwise. Can a man live a holy life till he is born again and is in possession of the free gift of eternal life? The gift is the "blade" but the prize is the full corn in the ear.[5][Mark 4:26-29] This is expressed in Rom. 5:17. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in (Millennial) life by one Jesus Christ. Did grace reign in the Galatians? No. The result then is exclusion from the Millennial Kingdom (Gal. 5:19-21). And this is the truth which is expressly taught in Rom. 5:8-10:

> ***"But God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were sinners, we were reconciled to God by the death of His son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."***

Here in the most explicit terms we have the doctrine of a twofold salvation. The believer was saved from the guilt of sin and justified the moment he believed in Christ. The verb, were reconciled, is in the aorist tense, and indicates a past act definite in time and place: (a) judicially, when the reconciliation was effected by Christ on the Cross; and (b) actually when the believer accepted Christ as his Savior. This provides a solid basis on which grace may operate and abound subjectively. I say, "may" for there are conditions which the believer must fulfill. These being met the process of sanctification begins, and thus "we are saved by His life". As to conditions, see Luke 9:23; 11:28; 14:25-35. "He that endureth to the end shall be saved" (Matt. 24:13). This is the path into "eternal life"; that is, the Messianic Kingdom.

The above interpretation is further confirmed by the prepositions employed in Rom. 6.23; 5:17-21. In the former passage the words, "in Christ Jesus our Lord", the preposition is *en* (εν) with dative of the place, or locality,

---

[5] Mark 4:26-29: We all have a physical and spiritual dualism (body and soul) which can also be more finely described as body, mind and soul or spirit; just so the degrees of salvation or eternal life can be differentiated 1st & 2nd degree in the broader, more general sense and 1st, 2nd and 3rd in the finer sense; it seems to me anyway. Coinciding with the three stages of the kingdom; or even the areas of the tabernacle/temple i.e., court/porch, holy, and holy of holies. So as the old saying goes: We **have been saved** from the ***penalty*** of sin through Christ's death on Calvary. We **are being saved** from the ***power*** of sin through Christ's work for us now at the right hand of the Father(1 John 2:1). We **shall be saved** from the ***presence*** of sin through Christ's coming for us (Rev. 21:27; 22:3).

where the gift is found without any reference to the way in which it is procured, or how it is to be developed. But in the latter the preposition is *dia* (διά) with the genitive: “By Jesus Christ our Lord” indicating that it is not by the death of Christ merely, that the second stage of salvation is to be effected; but by His continual intercession for us at the right hand of God, and the continuous impartation of His resurrection life by the Holy Spirit. And these are conditioned by unswerving faith in the believer.

In John 3:16 we have the dualism expressed in the unity of one outward form, and on the principal that the greater includes the lesser. This verse is usually understood to speak only of the free gift of life in Christ. If God so loved the world that He made provision in Christ for the pardon and justification of sinners only, that would be wonderful; but He did far more than that. He made provision that grace might abound to, and in, and through the believer, so that once saved he might not perish but have eternal life in the Messianic Kingdom. “Then believers may perish”, you say. Of course they may. But in what sense? In the sense that they are excluded from the Kingdom and have no part in the glory of the first resurrection, being still held by the power of death. But the believer does not thereby lose what he had in the first place—the gift of eternal life. Grip this thought firmly.

It is here that the respective theories of the Calvinist and the Armenian break down. They fail to explain and correlate the facts. We will resume this phase of the subject later.

But here arises a new problem: If “Eternal Life” as the prize differs from “Eternal Life” as the gift; and also, if “Eternal Life” as the prize is synonymous with the coming Messianic Kingdom, and that Kingdom is limited to 1000 years, it follows logically that the adjective aiōnios does not mean what it says in English. In other words, that our translations in both A.V. and R.V. are wrong. This is what we claim and desire to prove.

As, day by day, I followed up the clue given that December morning, 1913, I was convinced that those passages where aiōnios could be translated “eternal” were very few; and that fuller light would likely establish the conclusion that, so far as its essential meaning is concerned, it ought never to be so translated and interpreted. But as this is not necessary in order to establish our main line of argument I have decided to make no attempt to carry the discussion to its fullest limit. But inasmuch as the traditional eschatology is built almost exclusively on the assumption that “eternal” is the proper translation of aiōnios, it will follow that if this can be proven false, and therefore unscriptural, the generally accepted views of the churches of Christendom concerning the future state of both saved and unsaved will have to be abandoned. This is a very solemn matter and deserving of the most serious and painstaking consideration.

I am quite well aware that here we are on keenly contested ground; and, also, just as certain that in this very matter the last word has not been spoken. Right here Canon Farrar failed at his strongest point, that is, as a linguist. And as in the past, so now and in the days to come, we can count on the great enemy of truth and righteousness to still work through his favorite weapons, prejudice, custom, and gratuitous assumption, to keep out the light of God's word on this great subject. Permit just one sobering interrogation before coming to our task: Is there any room for doubt, so far as reason and observation can go, that if the traditional theory be true the Devil is going to reap a tremendously great harvest of lost souls; and Jesus Christ, notwithstanding His awful sufferings in which He tasted death for every man, is going to be compelled to be contented with a few crumbs from under the table of the World's Despotic Master and Ruler. But in the true light of the actual facts of the incarnation, life, death and resurrection of the Son of God, is this the best that God can do? Surely not! In such case can the Christ ever see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied? But let us pass from the realm of probabilities and conjectures, however plausible, to that of irrefutable facts. And we may here remark that what will most offend orthodox readers in this study is not what is said concerning the future state of the unsaved, but of the saved. Thus we have to meet the force of the orthodox view in two opposite directions.

What is the meaning of the Greek adjective aiōnios? As most religious people depend largely, even chiefly, on human authority rather than on what the word of God says, it may be well to note a few points in this connection by way of preliminary remark and evidence. Note the following data:

1. Rotherham, Young and others, translate aiōnios not by "eternal" or "everlasting", but by some such compound as age-lasting, age-abiding, or age-enduring, all of which have the same meaning. Now it is self-evident that age-lasting means lasting while the age lasts. And as every age has clearly defined boundaries *a quo* (from which) and *ad quem* (to which); it follows that in the Greek aiōnios and the English eternal we have two entirely different conceptions, one definitely limited, and the other unlimited, as to time. But both cannot be right. A limited eternity and an unlimited age are impossible conceptions. As well talk of an unlimited yard stick as an unlimited age. But these good men did not apparently see the necessary implications of their rendering. Had they done so, Young would never have rendered Isa. 9:6 by "the everlasting Father"; or "the father of eternity"; but "the Father of the age to come."
2. Trench in his work on "Greek Synonyms" admits that aiōnios sometimes has a limited significance.

3. Dr. Vincent in his "Word Studies in the New Testament" is most emphatic in his assertion that aiōnios never means eternal as English readers use the word. See his valuable note on 2 Thess. 1:9.[6] Thus it becomes evident that in our contention for a more exact rendering of this Greek adjective we are not without the support of scholarship. But we have more conclusive evidence than this.

SOME POSITIVE FACTS.

1. It is a fact that when the A. V. was made the Latin language was far better known, and more extensively used, than the Greek; and therefore the translators were greatly influenced both by the extensive use of Latin and by the Latin Versions then in use. Beza's translation and the Vulgate both translate aiōnios by *aeternus,* the cognate noun being *aeternitas,* whence come our English "eternal" and "eternity". This looks very suspicious. From the above it is as clear as the light of noon-day that the King James Translators instead of going back to the original Greek and translating the Greek *aiōnios* went to the Latin Vulgate and translated the Latin *aeternus.* If they had gone to the Greek, and acted as becomes scholars, they would have given us the same translation as Rotherham and Young, namely, age-lasting. Let the reader ponder the force of this argument. Make sure that you see the point.
2. It is equally a fact that the theology of the West was not that of the Greek Church, but that of Roman Catholicism. It was Latin theology.

And just as it is beyond doubt that the revisers, translators, and lexicographers, were chiefly influenced by the Latin language and Latin translations; so is it equally beyond doubt that the theologians of the Reformation were far more influenced by Latin Theology than Latin theology than by the word of God. It is admitted that the theology of Calvin was derived from Saint Augustine, modernized and extended; the same is true of the Anglican Church's Thirty Nine Articles. From this it follows that the current eschatology is not Greek, but Latin; not Biblical but traditional; and not Christian, but pagan in some of its most essential features. In this connection the reader would do well to look into "*The Church, The Churches, and The Mysteries*," by Pember.

Let us for a moment examine the condition of Latin Theology at the time when the traditional eschatology was fully established. I will quote from

---

[6] Eternal destruction (ολεθρον αιωνιον). Accusative case in apposition with δικην (penalty). This phrase does not appear elsewhere in the N.T., but is in IV Macc. 10:15 τον αιωνιον του τυραννου ολεθρον the eternal destruction of the tyrant (Antiochus Epiphanes). Destruction (cf. #1Th 5:3) does not mean here annihilation, but, as Paul proceeds to show, separation from the face of the Lord (απο προσωπου του κυριου) and from the glory of his might (και απο της δοξης της ισχυος αυτου), an eternity of woe such as befell Antiochus Epiphanes. αιωνιος in itself only means age-long and papyri and inscriptions give it in the weakened sense of a Caesar's life (Milligan), but Paul means by age-long the coming age in contrast with this age, as eternal as the New Testament knows how to make it. - *Robertson's N.T. Word Pictures*.

Milman's Latin Christianity. Let it also be remembered that the first four great Church Councils refused to formulate any creedal statement on eschatological lines. Nevertheless it is to Augustine, especially, that we must trace the roots and the foundation of the system of eschatology which has prevailed in the Protestant Churches since the reformation. In this connection Milman says:

> ***"Augustinianism was not merely the expression of the universal Christianity of the age as administering to, as being in itself the more full, fervent, continuous excitement of the religious sentiment, it was closely allied with the two great characteristic tendencies of Latin Christianity."***

"Latin Christianity, in its strong sacerdotal system, in its rigid and exclusive theory of the church, at once admitted and mitigated the more repulsive parts of the Augustinian theology. Predestinarianism itself, to those at least within the pale, lost most of its awful terrors. The Church was the predestined assemblage of those to whom and to whom alone, salvation was possible; the Church scrupled not to surrender the rest of mankind to that inexorable damnation entailed upon the human race by the sin of their first parents. As the Church, by the jealous exclusion of all heretics, drew around itself a narrower circle; this startling limitation of the divine mercies was compensated by the great extension of its borders, which now comprehended all other baptized Christians. The only point in this theory at which human nature uttered a feeble remonstrance was the abandonment of infants, who never knew the distinction between good and evil, to eternal fires. The heart of Augustine wrung from his reluctant reason, which trembled at its own inconsistency, a milder damnation in their favor. But some of his more remorseless disciples disclaimed the illogical softness of their master."

"Through the Church alone, and so through the hierarchy alone, man could be secure of that direct agency of God upon his soul, after which it yearned with irrepressible solicitude. The will of man surrendered itself to the clergy, for on them depends its slavery or its emancipation, as far as it was capable of emancipation. In the clergy, divine grace, the patrimony of the Church, was vested, and through them distributed to mankind. Baptism, usually administered by them alone, washed away original sin; the other rites and sacraments of which they were the exclusive ministers, were still conveying, and alone conveying, the influences of the Holy Ghost to the more or less passive soul. "I his objective and visible form as it were, which was assumed for the inward workings of God upon the mind and heart, by the certitude and security which it seemed to bestow, was so unspeakably consolatory, and relieved, especially the less reflective mind, from so much doubt and anxiety, that mankind was disposed to hail with gladness rather than examine with jealous suspicion these claims of the hierarchy. Thus the Augustinian theology coincided with the tendencies of the age towards the growth of the strong sacerdotal system; and the sacerdotal system reconciled Christendom with the Augustinian theology."-Milman's Works. Vol. I, page 171.

No student of ecclesiastical history will doubt the accuracy and the literal truthfulness of the above description by Milman of the condition of Christendom in the middle Ages. And the ability of the clergy to keep the people in abject submission to their authority depended more than anything else on their boasted power over the souls of men after they had left the body. For this purpose it was essentially necessary to formulate and boldly enunciate a system of eschatology which would, if the clergy so willed fix irrevocably the future destiny of the soul. And not only so, but it was necessary to so manipulate those portions of Scripture which threatened future judgment on the believer, in case of disobedience and unbelief, as to make them apply not to Christians but to sinners. And the same necessity exists today as we shall see later.

But while Latin Christianity wielded mighty power for many centuries, it did so because the human mind during those centuries was sleeping the sleep of death; hence the arbitrary power of the clergy and at the same time their gross immorality. Falsehood and superstition can only flourish in an atmosphere of intellectual lethargy and moral paralysis. Consequently, as soon as there came, in the good providence of God, the dawn of the Renaissance in the 14th century, Latin Theology could not face the light of

even a morally barren intellectual awakening. From that time Latin Christianity began to wane. Then the process of illumination received a mighty impetus from the Reformation under Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Knox.

3. Blessed, however, as was this work of God and man, it went neither deep enough, nor far enough, with the result that many of the most pernicious features of Augustinian theology and Latin Christianity survived the Reformation, and continue to this day to darken the heavens and benumb the moral and spiritual sensibilities of God's people; and thereby prove an inseparable barrier in the way of the progress of vital Christianity. Nevertheless, God is getting out of the world His "seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal." By the grace of God we want to help on the good work. The conclusion we draw from the above is simply this:

"It was absolutely essential to Augustinian theology with its blighting emphasis on the doctrine of predestinarianism to mistranslate the Greek adjective aiōnios, and put on it a meaning which the Greek will not for a moment allow in its respective applications to salvation and judgment. And that which was essential to Augustinian theology was equally essential to Latin Christianity from the days of Augustine to those of Calvin, Luther and Zwingli. And the same necessity exists in the Reformed Theology from then till the present. To say nothing of other words, the Calvinist simply cannot, dare not, face an honest and truthful interpretation of the two frequently occurring words with which we are now dealing, namely, "eternal life".

Perhaps the reader will say "Amen!" before he gets to the end of the book.

4. It is a fact that aiōnios is derived from the noun aiōn. By means of this latter word and its compounds the Greeks expressed their conceptions of time, past, present and future. No language can get along without some such word, or words. F.W. Grant in his *Facts and Theories as to a Future State* says aiōn is sometimes used for a limited time, and sometimes for unlimited time, namely, eternity. But Dr. Vincent in his "Word Studies" emphatically denies the latter construction; and he is certainly right, as we hope to demonstrate later on. The Greek aiōn may designate any period of time from the duration of human life up to the full length of an age in the history of a given nation. From the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt to the first advent of Christ is an age covering a period of 1491 years; and the present age has already lasted 191 years. Gal. 1:4 should read "this present evil age." The Holy Spirit in Rev. 20:1-4 tells us the age to follow this one will last a thousand years. For this reason, we call it the Millennium (*mille* a thousand). The term aiōn appears in the following combinations: For the age; for the ages; for the age of the ages, and for the ages of the ages. It is not evident that if the idea of eternity

could be expressed to the Greek mind by aiōn there would have been no need to make the above combinations. The tendency of language then, as now, is to eliminate superfluous words. How would it sound and look to an English reader to meet in a standard work, or, indeed, any work, such forms of expression as the following in order to express the idea of unending time: "For eternity, for the eternities, for the eternities of the eternities." The English reader would ask to be excused from wasting time on such needless superfluities. So also, and for the same reason, the Greek reader. But why do theologians and orthodox Bible students generally try so hard to get the idea of eternity into aiōn?

Because if they abandon that position, or rendering, the whole traditional eschatology falls to pieces. It is admitted that the adjective aiōnios is derived from the noun aiōn, and it must be admitted that aiōn always means a limited period of time, an age, with clearly cut and definitely located termini, *a quo* and *ad quem.*[7]

QUERY: How is it possible to derive an adjective expressive of unlimited time, or duration, from a noun which always conveys the thought of limited time?

Sometime after this thought had occurred to me I met it in Wilson's Diaglott.

5. Why did the Revisers of the A.V. insert, or rather, retain the word "world" in Matt. 28:20? They make Christ say: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world". But what He did say was: "Lo, I am with you always, unto the end of the age." In reply to Peter's question, He promised to those of His followers who were faithful to Him during His absence, He would give great reward in the age (not world) to come; plainly implying that those who were unfaithful would not share in the rewards, and, as He indicates in other passages, will not even share the blessedness of the coming age and Kingdom. I repeat the question: Why did the Revisers translate aiōn by world, instead of age? Because the Postmillennial theory of interpretation stands completely condemned before the correct rendering; and with its fall the traditional eschatology must also fall.
6. The idea is almost universal, and especially among scholars, that the primary and essential significance of aiōnios is that of time, whereas it is quality. The thought of time is not absent but it is secondary. In such expressions as the "eternal world." the "eternal Spirit", the "eternal God", this is the significance. In these cases aiōnios conveys the thought of existence, or being, which is above the limitations of

[7] "Similarly, ***terminus ad quem*** ("limit to which") is the latest possible date of a non-punctual event (period, era, etc.), while ***terminus a quo*** ("limit from which") is the earliest." Grant, Jim; Gorin, Sam; Fleming, Neil (2005), *The archaeology coursebook: an introduction to study skills, topics and methods* (2 ed.), Taylor & Francis, p. 90, ISBN 978-0-415-36077-7

time and the accident of circumstance, but says nothing about eternity past or future. Besides this, if the main idea of aiōnios was that of time the adjective would be superfluous, because eternity is one of God's attributes; and is therefore always latent and implied in the names of the Deity. It is singular that the lexicons should have been so confused in reference to the real meaning of this word. The above six lines of evidence demonstrate conclusively that the Greek aiōnios cannot be translated by the English eternal; and to do so is to give ourselves up to the darkness and delusion of the Middle Ages.

THE ARGUMENT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF EXEGETICAL NECESSITY.

7. We believe that the evidence already given is unanswerable, but that which we are now about to give is even more forceful. The word aiōnios occurs some seventy times in the New Testament. Wherever it is found in association with the names of Deity it makes good sense to render it by "eternal", but as already noted that is not its proper meaning. We will now examine this term where it is applied otherwise than to the names of Deity.

> ***"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrines of Christ, let us go on unto spiritual maturity; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God; of the doctrines of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment" (Heb. 6:1-2).***

"And being made perfect He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. 6:9).

Here we have the antithetical terms "Eternal Judgment" and "Eternal Salvation." Turn up what orthodox commentary you may, practical or critical, or listen to whatever orthodox preacher you may, and they will all give their united testimony that the former has reference to the eternal damnation of the unsaved, and the latter to the eternal bliss of believers.

Will the reader please pardon me if I seem presumptuous when I affirm that this is all wrong and utterly contrary to the principles of sound exegesis; and at the same time subversive of truth and righteousness. What we are about to prove is that both statements have reference to believers only, and are to be realized in the age to come; that is, within the limits of one thousand years. They have no reference to eternity except by implication. And surely it is manifest that believers cannot he eternally damned and eternally saved. The two ideas are mutually exclusive. And it is manifest that if this position can be established as scriptural the traditional eschatology, as to both the saved and the unsaved, will be undermined and must fall in irreparable ruin. Fact is the ruthless enemy of fiction. God's

great instrument in religion is truth; whereas the Devil's is fiction, that is, imitation of truth. Truth is, and was, and shall be, because God is, and was, and shall be. Fiction is something manufactured for the occasion and is successful only so far as it has the appearance of reality. The traditional eschatology has a little truth and a great mass of fiction.

FIVE FACTS.

1. The Bible divides all men into two classes—the saved and the unsaved.
2. It subdivides the saved into two classes—the carnal who live according to the flesh; and the spiritual who live according to the spirit (Rom. 8:13-14).
3. It presents the Kingdom of God, or of heaven, in two phases, one as in the present age when the King is absent and sin abounds in the world; the other as it shall be in the age to come, the King being present and grace abounding in the entire world. While the King is absent the Devil is present as the world's ruler; and when the King is present the Devil will be absent (Rev. 19:20; 20:1-6).
4. The Bible explicitly affirms that all believers are in the Kingdom in it's present phase; but carnal believers will not be able to enter the Kingdom in glory in the age to come (Gal. 5:19-21; Matt. 5:20).
5. The state in which believers die is that in which they will come before Christ to be judged. This judicial process may issue either in eternal (age-lasting) salvation, or eternal (age-lasting) judgment, according to Heb. 5:9; and 6:2. Let the reader note that we are here using the word "eternal", not in its English sense, but as a translation of aiōnios, that is, age-lasting, or lasting while the age lasts.

Before coming directly to our examination of aiōnios, permit another remark: We have seen the teaching of the Westminster Standards and of Protestantism generally as to the future state of believers. They say that at death the believer passes immediately into the presence of God and never can know any future judgment or sorrow. This is another of these flesh-pleasing fictions of the Middle Ages devised by priestcraft.

We may affirm, as a general and universal principal, that God, as a moral necessity inheriting in his holiness, cannot bestow any gift, either external or internal, on man without holding him strictly accountable for the use he makes of it. Why should the free gift of eternal life be an exception? But as a matter of fact it is universally assumed to be so. This is a great mistake. We will take an example. Dr. Scofield's notes, in his Reference Bible, are, on the whole, excellent; but occasionally he makes a serious slip as in his note on 2 Cor. 5:10, where Paul says:

"We (Christians) must all appear before the judgment seat (bema) of Christ that every one may receive for the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad."

On this passage Dr. Scofield comments as follows:

"The judgment of the believer's works, not sins, is in question here. These have been atoned for, and are "remembered no more forever" (Heb. 10:17) but every work must come into judgment, (Mat. 12:36); (Rom. 14:10); (Gal. 6:7); (Eph. 6:8); (Col. 3:24-25). The result is "reward" or "loss" (of the reward), "but he himself shall be saved". (1Co. 3:11-15)."

An examination of this paragraph reveals the following. Heb. 10:17: "And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." A mere glance at the context shows that the Holy Spirit is not here speaking of Christians, nor of this dispensation, but to the saved remnant of Israel at the second coming of Christ (see Jeremiah 31:31-40). The purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to show the Christian how he MAY attain to a similar position in the present age, and at the same time to indicate that very few are going to reach the goal. Heb. 12:14. Heb. 8:12 is the same as 10:17. At the close of the Millennial dispensation the Lord will be able to say of all believers of the present dispensation what He here says of all saved Jews at the beginning of the Millennium.

The third proof text used by the Doctor is Matt. 10:12 and it has no bearing on the subject whatever. Eph. 6:8 has reference to the Christian's good deeds, but says nothing of the evil; and the other three passages affirm the very opposite of the Doctor's contention. How very emphatic is Col. 3:25: "But He that doeth wrong (assuming that he has not made it right) shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons." Surely that is plain enough. Those who hold the theory in question say it is the believer's works and not his person that is to be judged. Is it conceivable that an evil work, apart from the person who does it, can be judged, the sentence executed and justice satisfied thereby? How would the theory work in civil jurisprudence? Suppose society should say, "We will let the murderer go free, but we will judge and punish the deed." But says one of the advocates of orthodox eschatology: "the believer's sins were all judged at Calvary.' Grant it. What then? Is Christ the minister of sin?

Was God's purpose in the atonement to put a premium on sinning; or was it that Christians might not sin (1 John 2:1)? The theory is essentially antinomian. Paul met it in his day as when he said, "Shall we sin then because we are not under the law but under grace?", and meets the thought with an emphatic "God forbid." Christ bore the believer's sin and sins on the cross judicially. But this will not save the believer from sinning; nor from reaping as he sows. Christ not only bore the sins of the believer at

the cross, but of the whole world, but this does not secure the salvation of any man apart from repentance and faith.

God took Israel to be His people while yet in Egypt and said to Pharaoh, ***"Let My people go that they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness" (Ex. 5:1).***

They all came under the blood, but on account of unbelief and disobedience they were overthrown in the wilderness and thus failed to enter the Promised Land. Paul takes up this very thought and shows that experience of Israel was typical of a like state of unbelief and disobedience among God's people in the present Church Age, and affirms that it will be followed by similar chastisement and judgment now and in the intermediate state in the age to come (1 Cor. 10:1-10; Gal. 5:19-21; Heb. 2:1-3). In the last passage the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews dwells on the comparison, the type and the anti-type, and draws the very solemn inference:

> ***"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip; for if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?"***

Thus we see that salvation is dual, or two-fold, first from the guilt of sin, and second from the power of sin; and these agree with and condition "eternal life" as the gift and as the prize. It is salvation in this second sense that the Holy Spirit is speaking of in Heb. 1:14; 2:3; and 5:9; and it is this that Christ has in view in Matt. 7:13, 14; 24:13; and Luke 13:24. The two classes of believers are described as to character in Matt. 7:24-27. Very few believers really hear Christ's words and do them, and thus they build on sand, while true believers dig deep and build on the rock. Luke 6:46, 49.

In Romans 11:14-24 the Holy Spirit warns Gentile believers that if they abide not in Christ they too shall be cut off. And this has been the actual state of the Church as an organization since the fourth century.

And what is it for members of the Church to be "cut off?" I am assuming the Church to be made up of people who are saved in the first degree. It is (a) to be put out of fellowship with Christ and the Divine Trinity here and now; and (b) to be excluded from the Messianic Kingdom for one thousand years. The Holy Spirit enumerates the works of the flesh, deadly personal sins, sins which have characterized the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time, and then declares most solemnly that they which do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God (Gal. 5:19-21). I have actually seen these words quoted by an orthodox writer as a proof text for the eternal damnation of the wicked. As has been said, "The Church delights to steal Israel's promises, leaving them all the curses." To

this it may be added that whatever in the New Testament applies to her and she does not like, she applies to the sinner. What absolute folly. Christ's last word out of Heaven to the Church in this dispensation is, "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be" (Rev. 22:12). This means judgment on carnal believers. It is the eternal (age-lasting) judgment of Heb. 6:2. The above thoughts not only pave the way for "eternal judgment" and "eternal salvation", but they will find ample confirmation as we proceed. We are now ready to apply the principles of sound exegesis to Heb. 6:2 and 5:9.

As the truth of justification is prominent in the Epistle to the Romans; so that of sanctification is prominent in Hebrews. And, moreover, as justification paves the way to practical sanctification, so the latter qualifies for the Millennial Kingdom; and thus realizes the truth of Heb. 12:14. The believer's sins were judged judicially at Calvary and judicially put away. We may assume that all sins up to the time of acceptance were forgiven and removed from the believer at that moment as far as the East is from the West. But there are sins in every believer after justification and the new birth. These may be treated in two ways: First, they may be repented of, forgiven, and put away, washed away through the precious blood of Christ. Second, if not so dealt with they stand on record and will appear against him at the judgment seat of Christ, with the result that he will be excluded from the Messianic Kingdom and will suffer in proportion to the degree in which he has erred and sinned (2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Cor. 5:5; and Gal. 6:6-8).

The Epistle to the Hebrews not only emphasizes the importance of the doctrine of practical sanctification, but also reveals God's will for it. Christ not only died for his people, but He rose and ever liveth to make intercession for them. Christ is greater than the angels; greater than Moses; and greater than Aaron (Heb. chaps. 1, 2). But there is real danger that such riches of grace will be abused; and if so God's displeasure will surely follow as in the case of Israel (Heb. Chaps. 3, 4). "We are made partakers of Christ (now and in the age to come) if (condition) we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end" (Heb. 3:14). "But Christ as a Son over His own house; whose house are we, if (condition) we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end" (Heb. 3:6). Now what is the hope? Study the word from Abraham to Paul, and Peter and John, and it is the Second Coming of Christ to found the Messianic Kingdom; to raise the faithful dead; and, on the believer's part, to have a place in the first resurrection and consequently in the Kingdom of the one thousand years. Has the Christian Church as a body any such hope? No. Since the third century God's people have been victimized by a philosophical theology which has robbed them of all of the most priceless treasures of God's Word.

Search the accepted Creeds and Confessions of Christendom and you will find that the Church knows nothing, of such a hope. And yet without this hope, and the type of character which it develops, there is nothing but exclusion for believers. “But”, you say, “Does not the expression, ‘There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God’ (Heb. 4:9) include all believers whether sanctified or carnal?

Pardon me if I shock you by saying, No, it does not. There is a difference between the redemption of purchase and the redemption of appropriation. God can even now say of the twelve tribes of Israel, “They are My people” by purchase; but he cannot say “They are Mine” by appropriation. “Then said God, Call his name Lo-ammi; for ye are not My people and I will not be your God (Hosea 1:9). This is exactly the position of the majority of believers in this age as is apparent from 2 Cor. 6:8-14; and Gal. 5:24. But the time shall come “that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, ye are the sons of the living God” (Hosea 1:10). This prophecy will be fulfilled at the Second Advent of the Messiah, and with it Heb. 8:12 and 10:17.

> ***“Then they that feared Jehovah (the covenant keeping God) spake often one to another; and Jehovah hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared Jehovah and that thought upon His name; and they shall be mine saith Jehovah of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them as a man spares his own son that serveth him” (Malachi 3:16, 17; Matt. 5:1-14; Luke 6:48; Eph. 3:17,19; Lev. 17:23).***

Were the ten spies and those murmurers in the wilderness among the Lord’s jewels? Were the Corinthians, the Galatians, and the Laodiceans? But in every age God has a few jewels like Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Joshua, Caleb, Samuel, David and others. It is of these that Christ Says, “Fear not little flock for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the (Millennial) Kingdom.” This is the hope, and this is the prize. Phil 3:7-14. There are many portions of the word of God which belong especially to this little company and which carnal believers cannot appropriate (see Heb. 11; Rom. 8; Matthew 5—7, and the Epistle to the Ephesians).

In Hebrews chapter five, the Holy Spirit points out the fact that notwithstanding God’s rich provision (4:14-1 6), the people addressed were falling back and were only able to take in the simplest Gospel truth, the milk of the word (Heb. 5:12-14). In chapter 6 he exhorts them to go on to perfection, that is, Christian maturity (Heb. 6:1-3). In 6:4-8 he warns them of the consequences of falling back, that is, of falling into a state where repentance becomes subjectively impossible, and in that case exclusion is inevitable. Then in 6:9-20 the writer expresses a hope of “better things”;

and “things that accompany (Millennial) salvation”; and again speaks of God’s rich provision for an overcoming Christian life. He speaks of God’s promises and God’s oath, and cites Abraham as an example of successful perseverance who “after he had patiently endured obtained the promise” of a son (Isaac is the type of Christ), and therein assurance of the Millennial inheritance (Heb. 6:15).

Let the reader turn up any orthodox commentary and it will tell you, as does Doctor Scofield, that Hebrews 6:4-8 has no reference to believers, but to mere professors and legalists who know nothing of the new birth. Here are the Doctor’s words:

“Hebrews 6:4-8 presents the case of a Jewish professed believer who turns back after advancing to the very threshold of salvation, Even “going along with” the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightenment and conviction (John 16:810). It is not said that he had faith. This supposed person is like the spies at Kadesh-Barnea (Deut. 1:19-26) who saw the land and had the very fruit of it in their hand, and yet turned back”.

We will endeavor to prove that this is bad exegesis. The Doctor errs in interpretation and in application. Will the reader note the following considerations in opposition to the traditional view?

1. The Epistle as we have seen is addressed to believers.
2. Its theme is holiness (*hagiasmos,* Heb. 12:14) as the condition of entering the Messianic Kingdom where God is fully revealed.
3. Up to Hebrews chapter 6, the sinner does not come once within the horizon of the writer, for he is writing exclusively to believers.
4. In Hebrews 6:1-3, and 9-20, the exhortation is very definitely to believers, containing the most solemn warnings and inspiring encouragements, and so to the end of the Epistle.
5. Is it exegetically possible that the writer could pass from the case of the unfaithful believer to that of the sinner between verses 3 and 4 and give not the slightest hint of such an abrupt transition in the unfolding of his thought? And then, again, assuming that he does, is it possible that he could jump back to the case of the believer at verse 9 without the slightest indication of any change of subject matter and without any particle of transition? Besides, if we grant that he is addressing sinners in verses 4-8, what relevancy would that have to the subject in hand (the sanctification of believers as a preparation for in the age to come)? None whatever, for he is speaking of believers going on to maturity as the condition of avoiding exclusion from the Messianic Kingdom.
6. In Hebrews 6:9-10, he says:

"But beloved, we are persuaded better things of You, and things that accompany salvation though we thus speak; for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love."

Thus we see the perfect continuity of the theme. The very ones who were in danger of falling away beyond possibility of renewal are the "beloved" of whom he is persuaded "better things and things that accompany (Millennial) salvation." In other words, two possibilities lay before the people addressed: on the lower As that of falling back so as to come under the sentence of eternal (age-enduring) judgment; and on the upper side that of going on like true sons of Abraham to eternal (age lasting salvation. Or, to state the case more forcefully, the believer of this age has the choice of spending the age to come (the thousand years) in Hadean shame and darkness, or in celestial glory and light. The reader will admit that this is a tremendously serious matter. But to make still more sure of our ground let us examine verses 4 to 8 internally:

1) They had been once enlightened.
2) They had tasted the heavenly gift.
3) They had been partakers of the Holy Ghost.
4) They had tasted the good word of God.
5) They have tasted the powers of the age to come.
6) They have had a taste of the coming glory.

Now I ask the reader, did ever any unregenerate man have such an experience as that? Is it not perfect and blessed as far as it goes. It is safe to say that ninety per cent of believers on the earth today can not testify to anything better than that; and the majority of them cannot come up to it. And yet orthodox writers would fain have us believe that the people addressed (in these verses) were unregenerated sinners. Nothing but the dire necessities of a false theory of interpretation handed down from the darkness of the Middle-Ages could induce any man to so pervert the word of God in the interest of carnal expediency. No doubt the Doctor is sincere, and is not to be classed with post-millenarian interpreters; but like many others was unable to fully extricate himself from the traditions of men. Indeed no man has been able to do this except in the degree that he is under the power of God's Holy Spirit.

(7) ***"If they shall fall away."*** He does not say they will. If, however, they do fall away, to which we are all liable, the penalty is exclusion from the Messianic Kingdom; and this involves the believer in the age-lasting judgment of chapter 6:2.

If on the other hand they walk in the steps of Abraham, the Father of the faithful, they will through faith and patience inherit the promise. Hebrews

6:15. Can it be said of a mere professor, an unregenerate sinner, that if he keeps on in the path before him it will be well with his soul in the end? Surely not! And if so, then the writer is not talking to sinners but to Christians.

And was not the peril of apostasy among the Hebrews also the peril of the Corinthians and the Galatians in Paul's day; and of the Ephesians in John's day? And is it not the peril of believers all through this dispensation? Thus Israel is a perfect type of the Christian Church in her unbelief and disobedience and consequent failure to reach the land of promise and there abide (John 15:6).

Dr. Scofield cites the case of the ten spies (Deut. 1:19-26) as though they were lost sinners. On the contrary they are a type of the great mass of official believers who are yet full of unbelief in reference to the truths of prophecy and the Millennial Reign of Jesus Christ. So with the children of Israel who fell in the wilderness. An examination of Heb: 10:26-31 leads us to the same conclusion as our study of 6:4-8. And how forcefully the Holy Spirit brings the facts home to us when Paul says:

> ***"Now these were our ensamples (warnings) to the intent that we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted (1 Cor. 10:1-10).***

How could they be examples to us if they do not belong to the same class and if we are not in danger of the same judgment?

Let me here state an awfully solemn fact: From such passages of Scripture as Matt. 13:1-49; 16:21-27; 24:32-51; 25:1-30; 1 Cor. 10:1-10; Rom. 11:14-44; and Rev. chaps. 2 and 3; as well as from an honest study of the history of Christendom, we are obligated to conclude that very few of the saved in this dispensation will be able to share in the glory of the first resurrection and the Messianic Kingdom; so that exclusion with its disciplinary and penal consequences is their sure inheritance. Truly it is a fearful thing (for a worldly Christian) to fall into the hands of the living God (Heb. 10:31; 12:29). Personally, I confess that except as I follow Christ in the way of the Cross with its rejection by the world, especially the religious world, I have no hope of a place with Him in His Millennial Reign (Luke 9:23; 14:25-35).

Let no man say that the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not for Gentile Christians in these respects. The children of Israel held three positions and they are all typical: (**1**) In Egypt under the blood of the Passover Lamb—the type of Christ; (**2**) in the wilderness on their way to Canaan—type of the believer's utter dependence upon God as he journeys through this spiritually barren world; and also the natural dislike of the flesh in the believer for such a position; (**3**) and then in the land of promise. Let me put it thus: Israel in the wilderness, relative to the Promised Land, is a type of the Church in the world, relative to the coming Messianic,

Millennial Kingdom. Doctrinally we have the anti-type of Israel's three positions in Rom. 6; 7; 8.

Romans 6 gives the believer's standing and immeasurable objective riches in Christ; and also the path by which these riches are to be made subjectively real (6:3-5). But the believer has yet to learn how to walk in this path so that Christ may get His rights in him.

Romans 7 represents the believer beginning to recognizes of his inheritance in Christ and reaching out after them only to find himself under the dominion of the self-life, because he does not understand the place and work of the Holy Spirit as the only one who can bring him through death to self into Canaan. He seeks to reach the goal in his own strength, though unconsciously, and fails. The flesh is stronger than the spirit.

Romans 8. Here the believer has given up his fleshly struggle, sells his all for the pearl of great price and puts on the whole armor of God and is able to say, "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death", Here he stands by faith. This, spiritually, is an earnest of the land of promise.

To suppose, with Arminian Theology, that Rom. 7 is the experience of one seeking salvation by works is as contrary to sound exegesis as it is to Christian experience and observation.

Thus on grounds of exegetical necessity we have demonstrated that the adjective aiōnios in Heb. 6:2; 5:9 cannot be rendered eternal or everlasting, but age-lasting; that is, lasting throughout the age referred to. At the end of that age the judgment will be lifted after that the carnal believer has got right with God, and he will then enter the Kingdom in its really eternal state. This throws some light on at least one phase of the truth of Acts 3:21. In our study of the narrative concerning the Rich Young Ruler we were obliged, on grounds of exegetical necessity, to come to the same conclusion concerning the meaning of the word aiōnios.

We believe that we have now established a principle which we may formulate thus: Wherever we find the adjective aiōnios associated with nouns other than those which are descriptive of God, or His attributes, we are to interpret it as confined to the age to come, and as falling entirely within the limits of the Millennial Kingdom. And in most cases it makes good sense and expresses the true meaning when rendered by the word Millennial.

After having come to this conclusion, I began to search in order to find if any other writer had been lead in this path. I found that Samuel Minton in "The Glory of Christ" had caught the clue for a moment and then lost it.

We will now examine several other passages where aiōnios occurs. Let us postulate three facts: **First**, the personal ministry of Christ was exclusive to the Jews. He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of

Israel." { Mat. 15:24 } **Second**, the one great, over-mastering hope of every true Israelite from Abraham to Christ was the Coming of Messiah, when the son of David and the son of Abraham (Matt. 1:1) would Reign upon David's throne and Israel would b the first nation in the world (Luke 1:67-80). **Third**, when Christ began His ministry among the Jews He proclaimed Himself as the Messiah of the Prophets, and claimed faith in Himself as such. Not to receive Him as Messiah was to reject Him entirely. Grant these three propositions, and we affirm that in the following passages where eternal or everlasting are found in association with life (zōē) the reference is not to eternity but to the coming Messianic Kingdom.

> ***Matt. 19:16, 21; Mark 10:30; Luke 10:25; 18:18-30; John 3:15, 36; 4:36; 5:24, 39; 6:27, 40, 47, 54, 68; 10:28; 12:25, 50; 17:2-3; Acts 13:46, 48; Rom. 2:7; 5:21; 6:22; Gal. 6:8; 1Tim. 1:16; 6:12, 19; Titus 1:2; 3:7; 1John 2:25; 5:11, 13, 20; Jude 1:21.***

Sometimes, as in John 3:16, the free gift of eternal life by implication lies behind the prize and is taken for granted; but the main idea looks forward to the full realization of Israel's most glorious hope in the Millennial Kingdom. The following expressions refer to the same period, "eternal judgment" (Heb. 6:2); "eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12); "eternal inheritance" (Heb. 9:15); "eternal glory" (1 Peter 5:10); "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." In all the above cases aiōnios should be translated "age-lasting." The reader will be ready to admit that if what we have just said is true, the sub-title of the book-"A Revolution in Eschatology"—is quite appropriate.

We will enlarge briefly on a few of the above passages. Take 1 Tim. 1:16: ***"Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all long suffering, for a pattern to them (Christians) who should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting."*** It is evident that Paul is not here referring to the gift of "eternal life" but to the prize; and he indicates that it can only be won by living the kind of a life he lived. This agrees with Matt. 7:13, 14; Luke 13:24; Rom. 2:7.

Paul says to Timothy; ***"Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and has confessed a good profession before many witnesses" (1 Tim. 6:12).*** Timothy had been converted many years before this, and was therefore in possession of the free gift of eternal life. Paul could not exhort him to contend for something he already possessed. On the other hand, eternal life in this passage cannot refer to the eternal state beyond the Millennium, for the reason that absolutely all believers are sure of that. The problem is, shall

we spend the one thousand years with Christ in glory, or in the darkness of the Hadean world? Peter urges believers thus:

> ***"And besides this, giving all diligence add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge self-control; and to self-control patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity; for if these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall be neither barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he (the believer) that lacketh these things (and most Christians do lack them) is blind, and cannot see afar off (to the Messianic Kingdom), and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins (sins committed before conversion). Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election (to a place in the Messianic Kingdom) sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall (implying that if they do not do them they will fall); for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting (age-lasting) Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."***

We feel sure that every honest reader now sees clearly the distinction between the free gift and the prize; and also the different methods by which each is secured; the one by faith without works, and the other by faith expressed through works. Let us listen to the Savior's talk with the woman at the well: "Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life" (John 4:13, 14). Let us now translate the fourteenth verse correctly: "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall not thirst for, or in, the age (to come); but the water that I shall give him shall become (not *eimi* but *ginomai)* in him a fountain of water springing up into age-lasting life (in the Messianic Kingdom) ".

The majority of believers does not understand nothing of the ever flowing fountain within coming into expression in thought, word, and act because of the presence and effective operation of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the crucified but now glorified Christ. They know an inner fountain, but one of an altogether different kind (Matt. 15:18-20; Gal. 5:19-21). We all know this only too well. God alone can displace it with the fountain of life (zōē).

On another occasion Christ made use of the following expression:

> ***"Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death for, or in, the age (to come)" (John 8:51).***

Now this cannot mean physical death, for it is appointed unto men once to die, from which even the Apostles were not exempt. The meaning then is that those who really hear and keep the word of Christ in their hearts will be in a state of real life and fellowship with God in glorified bodies during the Millennial period; but those who do not hear and obey the word will continue in a state of death and partial alienation from God, and consequent exclusion from His presence during the same period. Christ said to the Jews:

"Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal (Millennial) life: and they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39; 6:68-69).

I would again remind the reader that the prophetic outlook of patriarchs, historians and prophets of the Old Testament, WAS NOT ON ETERNITY, but on the Messianic Kingdom. The New Testament also begins and ends with this same thought in the foreground; and rarely passes the dividing line between time and eternity. The recognition of this fact is vital to scriptural exegesis.

I wish now to call the reader's attention, in the light of the above facts, to a new interpretation of a particular portion of scripture, and request that he put more than usual energy into his powers of volition and discrimination. It is this:

"And to you who are troubled (there were many believers in that day who were not troubled, as now, because they avoided the offence of the cross (John 12:42-43; 9:22; 16:2; Gal. 5:37; Matt. 10:37-39; I Tim. 6:13), rest with us (who are kept by the power of God through faith (1 Peter 1:3-5) when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints and to be admired in all them that believe, because our testimony was believed among you, in that day" (2 Thess. 1:7-10).

The universal interpretation of this passage, as to the judgment foretold, has applied it to sinners and to them only. But, astonishing as it may appear at first sight, I am convinced that its reference is to carnal believers. It was one of the fatal errors of the Jews to imagine that because they were the children of Abraham they could never by any possibility become the objects of God's displeasure; or that their beautiful City and magnificent Temple could ever be desecrated by Gentile supremacy. In this also they are a type of the Christian Church. Such is the power and folly of devotion to the traditions of men. Surely it is time that we were getting away from the shackles of Latin Theology; and especially, from its Pagan Eschatology.

Let us look for a moment at 2 Thess. 1:7-10. Note the following points:

(a) Very few Christians have suffered for the Kingdom's sake.

(b) Only a very small proportion of them believe in the pre-millennial coming.

(c) Very few of them know God (1 John 2:3-6).

(d) Very few of them obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. In this they are like Israel (1 Sam. 15:22; Jer. 7:23; 2 Thess. 3:14; Heb. 5:9).

(e) There is something more serious than age-lasting destruction for sinners.

(f) "His saints" in verse 10 does not here include all believers, but those that have really lived holy lives (Heb. 12:14 in contrast with I Cor. 3:1-15 and Gal. 5:19-21).

(g) "To be admired in all them that believe". Here again not all believers are included but only those who believe the full gospel, and by the grace of God live it out in their lives. This interpretation agrees perfectly with Matt. 7:13-14; Luke 13:24; 1 Cor. 10:1-10; Rom. 11:14-24: Gal. 6:7-8; Rom. 2:1-11; and Rev. 3:14-20. Paul affirms that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness." One has only to examine the history of Christianity ever so superficially to see the prevalence of these sins in the Church ever since the days of the Apostles. I feel free to say with absolute assurance that I am speaking the truth, that he who accepts the Post-Millenarian interpretation of the Scriptures is holding the truth in unrighteousness. In 2 Thess. 1:9 we have the expression "everlasting destruction."

Now it is certain that no man who has in him God's free gift of eternal life can ever suffer "eternal destruction" from the presence of the Lord; but he may suffer age-lasting destruction. This is clear from Matt. 10:37-39 and John 8:51. God's ancient people, with few exceptions, are even now undergoing this kind of destruction. It has been assumed that neither *olethros* nor *apoleia* (both translated destruction) are ever applied to the believer in the scriptures; but this is a wholly gratuitous assumption which is in perfect keeping with many other unscriptural factors in the traditional eschatology. We cannot enlarge on this point at the present time. It is a sobering thought to think that of the six hundred thousand men who came out of Egypt under the power of the blood of the Passover Lamb, only two, Joshua and Caleb entered the land of promise. It is significant that not one of the tribe of Levi, whose work it was to minister to God in the Holy things of the Tabernacle, had faith enough, and loyalty to Jehovah enough, to enter the land promised to Abraham their father. All the others, even

Moses, died in the wilderness. What food for meditation and serious reflection there is in this solemn fact.

We should remember that the sin of Moses was not like that of the people. He was not guilty of murmuring. Yet in the face of these most solemn warnings orthodox teachers tell us that the believer is, at the moment of his death, made perfect in glory, and this in the face of the other fact that the Holy Spirit through Paul says:

"For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense or reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him" (Heb. 2:1-3; 5:9; 1:14; Matt. 24:13).

In reference to 2 Thess. 1:7-10, the orthodox interpreter faces a dilemma: The reference is either to believers or sinners. If to believers, then there is surely age-lasting judgment for those who disbelieve and disobey the gospel of Jesus Christ. (Heb. 6:2). On the other hand, if it belongs to sinners, then he must write himself down a restitutionist, for in this case the wicked will not suffer eternally, but only one thousand years, for we have proven that aiōnios in all references to the future is limited to the Millennial Period. Let the reader decide where he stands.

There are, as already remarked, two great motives to holy living. They are love and fear, and in the nature of things they are complimentary for the reason that God is to be loved and feared. He is to be loved for what He is, and what He does for His creatures both in creation and redemption; and He is to be feared because of His holiness, His hatred of sin, and the certainty that He will punish it. In the very nature of things the man who loves God most will fear Him most. The Scriptures say, **"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him and He will show them** (and them only) **His covenant"**. Yes, even of the Lord of glory it is said, **"He was heard in that He feared"** (Heb. 5:7). How blessed it would have been for the children of Israel if at Kadesh-Barnea they had feared the unbelief and disobedience of their own hearts rather than the giants and walled cities of Canaan. Compare Numbers 13 and 14 with Hebrews 3 and 4.

Before closing this chapter we will turn our attention briefly to a few of the orthodox strongholds of this plausible but delusive theory which we have been seeking to bring into the limelight of God's infallible truth; namely, that there is no judgment for believers. The first of these strongholds which we will examine is Romans 8:1: ***"There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."***

We will take the verse just as it reads in the A.V. Examining the passage on purely grammatical grounds we see that it is composed of one independent and three dependent propositions. Thus:

"There is no condemnation (to certain persons)." There are three dependent propositions all of which qualify and limit the pronoun "them":

1. who are in Christ Jesus (this excludes all unsaved sinners).
2. who walk not after the flesh (this excludes all believers who walk after the flesh). There are few who do not.
3. but who walk after the Spirit (this limits the "no condemnation" to the very small number who walk in the Spirit. Thus Paul and the Master are in perfect accord (Luke 13:24).

The plain implication is that for believers who walk after the flesh there will be condemnation; and in Gal. 5:19-21 Paul positively affirms that there will.

But someone will reply, "The R.V. omits the last two dependent propositions, and reads, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," and with this correction our fortress still stands, and stands firmly." We think the R.V. is correct in the omission. This being granted, we have a new problem on hand, for how are we then to reconcile Rom. 8:1 and such passages as Gal. 5:19-21; Rom. 1:17-18; and scores of others Scriptures? We lay it down as an axiomatic principle that the word of God is one and harmonious in all its parts. Therefore the first thing to do is to open our Greek testament and see if the translation of Rom. 8:1 is correct. And this is what we read: "There is therefore, now no DAMNATION to them that are in Christ Jesus". Thus viewed there is perfect harmony between Rom. 8:1 and the other passages cited. As the verse stands in A.V. and R.V. we have not a statement of God's fact, but man's fictitious interpretation of that fact. Let us look at the matter more closely.

There are in the Greek Testament four words to be examined in this connection, all nouns. They are *krima, krisis, katakrima,* and *katakrisis.* The last two are formed by prefixing the intensive preposition *kata* to the first two. Now the strongest of the four, that is, the one expressive of the severest punishment, is *katakrima,* and it is never applied to believers, while the other three are, though not exclusively. *Katakrima* occurs only three times. Thus: "Judgment was by one (Adam) to damnation" (Rom. 5:16). "Therefore by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to damnation" (Rom. 5:18). ***"There is therefore now no damnation to them that are in Christ Jesus"*** (Rom. 8:1). I trust the reader sees clearly the significance of the proper translation. It is inexcusable on the part of the translators not to have chosen a word for *katakrima* which would have

distinguished it from the other three; since they are applied to believers and it never is.

We may add that *katakrima* in its verbal form, *katakrinō,* occurs nineteen times, but it is not necessary for our present purpose to discuss these. That there is judgment for the believer we have seen in Heb. 6:1-8; 10:26-31. To these we may add Matt. 7:2; 1 Cor. 11:29-34; James 3:1. And this judgment may issue in *krima* but not in *katakrima. Krima* is used in the following passages: Matt. 7:2; 23:14; Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47; 23:40; 24:20; John 9:39; Acts 24:25; Rom. 2:2; I Cor. 11:29, 34; Gal. 5:10; 1 Tim. 5:12; Heb. 6:2; 1 Pet. 4:17, 18, and several others. We remark here in reference to 1 Pet. 4:17, 18, which the interpretation is the same as that given in 2 Thess. 1:7-10. The righteous of verse 18 only includes the really sanctified. Compare Matt. 13:49.

> Another stronghold of the traditional eschatology is John 5:24:
>
> ***"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation*** (krisin, accusative singular of krisis); ***but is passed from death unto life."***

It really looks as though the traditionalists had a secure hiding place here. But if so, the question comes up again, "How shall we reconcile the verse with scores of other passages which affirm positively that the believer will be judged (Col. 3:24-25)?" I wrestled with this verse for some time before I found the secret and saw its harmony with other parts of the word. The Inductive Method of Bible study demands that we examine every available fact, and establish as far as possible its congruity with the whole body of facts so far as already known. The key to John 5:24 is in the clause, "and believeth on Him that sent Me." We get light from Heb. 7:25. Our great High-Priest is "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him". Here we see again how that the dependent proposition qualifies and limits "them". It is possible to come to Jesus for pardon and the New Birth, and yet not go through Him to the Father. The congregation of Israel could come as a body into the outer court, but only the priests could enter the holy place; while only the high priest could enter the holiest. God the Father is found in the holiest of all. It is true that in the death of Christ the veil separating the holy place and the holiest was rent. This is a great fact, but it is objective to the believer, and must find its counterpart subjectively in the rending of the veil of his own flesh. This is the true circumcision (Rom. 2:28; compare Rom. 6:3-5). Alas! How few of us have entered into the actual experience of being really crucified with Christ. Paul gloried in this experience (Gal. 6:14); and so will every believer who through the illumination of the Holy Spirit gets a vision of the beauty and ineffable glory of the coming Messianic Kingdom. He too shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied. Thus we see again that John 5:24 is Rom.

8:1, and Luke 13:24 in another form. Christ is able to save unto the uttermost, but only when we forsake all to follow Him, and sell all for the pearl of great price (Luke 9:23). Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is not the end, but the way to the end (John 14:6). And He is the only way (John 10:1-11). It is possible to know the Son superficially and yet not know the Father. Christ says most solemnly, “All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son and he to whom the Son will reveal Him. “The synthetic dualism of Eternal Life” is an established fact.

CHAPTER 3:
ANTITHETIC DUALISM OR LIFE VERSUS DEATH.

> ***“Let it be assumed that each article of our creed is well warranted by Scripture; it may notwithstanding be true that indefinite misconceptions, affecting the Divine character and government, or that certain modes of feeling generated in evil days, and still uncorrected, exist, and operate to benumb the impulsive and expansive energies of the Gospel. Our interpretation of Christianity may be good, and may be pure enough for private use; it may be good in the closet, good as the source of the motives of common life, and good as the ground of hope in death, and yet may be altogether unfit for conquest and triumph. That it is so unfit, should be assumed as the only pious and becoming explication we can give of the almost universal ignorance and irreligion of mankind.”– Fanaticism, by Isaac Taylor.***

The whole Universe so far as it is brought within the comprehension of man by scientific observation or revelation, is divided morally into two great empires, good and evil, which include the sum total of rational created being. I say “created being”, for while God is imminent in both, yet He transcends both. Each of these empires seeks supremacy and universality at the expense of the other. There is no third empire and there is no neutral ground. Every rational intelligence is here, or there, or nowhere. The antithesis is constitutional, ineradicable, and universal. One of these opposing empires may, I do not say it will, some day cease to be; but while it exists and persists it cannot be or become other than it is by virtue of its essential nature. Light in its essence can never become darkness, nor darkness light. The Empire of truth and purity and love can never bring aught to man but what is essentially good, though the good may not always seem to be what it really is. So, on the contrary, the empire

of darkness can never bring aught but evil, though it may often seem otherwise. This truth is not open to intellectual demonstration except through the avenue of the heart; and not even there except through the fellowship of the Christ and His Cross. Compare Gen. 3 and Phil. 3.

Herein lies the problem of life, a problem which every finite intelligence is seeking consciously or unconsciously to solve by way of Calvary, or by way of an all absorbing egotism.

If each of these vast antithetic empires occupied a place, or territory, or world, by itself, the one equally live to the other, and one could choose for himself to live here or there, the problem would be vastly simplified for honest hearts. But would not the very fact of such simplification carry with it by logical sequence the nullification of latent possibilities? How then would that “eternal life” which was with the Father and which was brought into manifestation through the agony of Gethsemane and the tragedy of Golgotha get a real root and a firm footing in the heart and life and destiny of man? That which was born into objective being in the Christ through indescribable moral conflict can only become subjectively real and victorious in man by extension of the same ethical process through the power of the Holy Spirit within. “If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death we shall also be in the likeness of His Resurrection”, Rom. 6:3-5, and not otherwise. In the nature of things there is no simplification of the necessity and mystery of Calvary. If it were now possible for God by an almighty fiat to completely separate these two great empires so as to dissolve the dualism subjectively in His people, and place an impassible gulf between the good and the evil, the result would, it seems to me, be as unfortunate for the Christian as for the sinner; for the reason that that would be to annihilate the mystery by bringing the moral conflict with its beneficent discipline to a premature termination, and thereby to rob life (zoe), if we have it and know it, of its latent potentiality, thus obliging redeemed man to spend eternity at an unfortunate distance from his Creator and Redeemer; for man can only be what he ought to be as he is conformed to the image of the Christ through suffering, in the possession of conscious freedom, in depth of virtue, and wealth of personality.

It is difficult to conceive of a world of absolute goodness into which children might be born where neither they nor their parents had ever known evil even through the prohibition of something within the limits of human desire; and where at the same time, moral integrity could be preserved only by a heroic choice of the will. Could freedom, virtue, and personality, have anything more than an imaginary existence in such a state?

The thought of God as unitary, self-existing, self determining, eternal, immutable, and holy, is not only thinkable but absolutely necessary. The

thought of God as not self-existent and self-determined is unthinkable, and such a God would be dependent, and therefore not God at all. The dependent is the finite and relative, and implies the independent, the infinite and absolute. A chain of unlimited antecedents, or sequents, is unthinkable; therefore the conception of independence, self-existence, eternity and holiness, considered individually and in their unity as attributes of God, is a primary postulate of the human mind and heart. Thus there is no room and no possibility of an antithetic dualism in God. This conception of God is immediate and intuitive.

But on the other hand that which precludes the possibility of such a dualism in the Creator is the very thing which makes it possible, and, I might almost say, desirable, in the creature, as the world, as the universe, as man.

God could not contemplate the work of creation as He made it without foreseeing the possibility and, indeed, the certainty of the entrance of evil, for the simple reason that an independent, self-existing creation is an impossibility. The rational creature must be free to choose between moral opposites in order to possess rationality and moral integrity worthy of man in his relation to his fellows, the world, and God. Such a being must be bound to God and to the whole of which he is a part by many bonds of relationship-physical, mental, and spiritual-with their accompanying power of affirmation and negation, of knowledge and ignorance, moral integrity and moral obliquity. Thus, and thus only, can freedom in choice, loyalty to truth, and devotion to God be imbodied in human personality worthy of intimate, comprehensive, and abiding communion with God.

Thus this antagonistic dualism, with all its latent possibilities for good or evil, is not only in the world, but it is in man; and not simply in man as a sinner, but in man as a saint. It is in every man who is born of woman and begotten of man. But there was and is One Man born of woman but not begotten of man, and He was absolutely sinless. And yet in being “made sin for us” He entered into the profoundest experience of the heights and depths of this awful dualism in a way forever beyond the capacity of any finite personality. And in doing so He broke its power for all who truly love Him, and paved the way for the everlasting separation of these two great empires, with complete victory on the side of truth and righteousness and God. Thus, indeed, will the empire of evil lose its relative greatness. Jesus Christ is not a son of a man; but He is the Son of Man. The Fall came through man and so must the Restoration. Rom. 5:12-21. The Christ must triumph. He is not only self-existent but in Him the created universe consists.

Granting then: 1. The self-existing and holy God; 2. the fallen sinful creature; and 3. the incarnate God-Man between and with one hand on each, I conclude that this is the best of all worlds into which a man can be

born; and where freedom, virtue and personality can, because of the presence of good and evil, be developed to the highest possible degree of perfection; and thus man to all eternity may find the most intense and comprehensive correspondence in thought, feeling and volition with the ultimate First Cause-the Triune God. This, and not mere locality, is what constitutes Heaven. And the want of this with its ethical and spiritual implications, and not mere locality, is what constitutes Hell.

Thus the consciousness of a subjective dualism, involving as it does betimes the most fearful conflicts both within and without, is not really a calamity except as we deliberately make it so by personal choice of the evil in preference to the good.

Shall we then say that sin was, or is, a necessity? Not so if God were satisfied with man as a creature only. But this could not satisfy the love and wisdom and power of God. He could and did produce His image in man by creative fiat; but He could not impart His nature so that fallen men might become His sons, except by the incarnation, the suffering and sacrificial death of the Christ, wrought out first objectively and then subjectively.

To ask the question: Was sin a necessity? is virtually the same as to enquire: Could man become what Christianity proposes to make him without being subjected to the process of discipline implied in his position in a world where he is permitted to voluntarily choose between good and evil in various ways and under diverse circumstances? If so we have no way of knowing it, or even conceiving of it. I state this not to raise the discussion of a metaphysical problem in which men are apt to lose themselves in useless speculation, but because the fact and the question have profound eschatological significance and real profit.

Redemption is not an expedient of Divine wisdom to repair the damage effected in the first creation by the introduction of sin; but it is the fact and the process whereby the first creation can find its true use and end in providing a platform on which the mystery of the incarnation and the tragedy of the Cross might be enacted and God revealed. In short, apart from the fall man never could have been what he now can be and will be. And may I go a step further and say that without the fall of man God could never have been what He is, and yet shall be, in manifestation of the deepest glory of His character. God is Spirit; God is Light; God is Love. And that not as inward potential possibility; but as outward manifested reality and glory. This is equivalent to saying that the ultimate end of creation and redemption must justify the Divine permission of evil, and that on a scale of overwhelming magnitude.

In the former chapter we were occupied with the words “eternal life”; and there we saw that the Scriptures reveal a synthetic dualism—the gift and the prize, the former containing the latter in germ, and the latter carrying

to full manifestation the inherent potentiality, worth and glory of the former.

But once the gift has been received there rests upon the receiver a tremendous responsibility in that he must co-operate with the Holy Spirit and with the Divine Trinity in developing the latent possibilities of the germ, so that God may perfect through discipline the work He began in the new birth. The Christian who resists the Spirit's leading and neglects God's provision in this matter is a greater sinner than the Israelite who refused to overcome the difficulties of the wilderness and thus enter Canaan; and his penalty will be more severe, for "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation"? Heb. 2:1-3; Matt. 24:13.

In other words, THE BELIEVER IS ON PROBATION. He has to choose between eternal (age-lasting) salvation; or eternal (age-lasting) judgment. The Church on earth does not so teach nor believe; but the Bible does; and so do all the saved who have passed behind the vail. Moses said to Israel: See, I have set before thee this day life and good (on the one side) and death and evil (on the other). Deut. 30:15. Paul says to the Church of the present dispensation, or age: "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die (spiritually); but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live (spiritually). Rom. 8:13. Both Israel and the Church with few individual exceptions have chosen the way to spiritual death. Only those who have attained real spiritual union with the Christ by self-denial and self-sacrifice effected through the power of the Spirit of Christ as crucified and risen, will share in the glory of the first-resurrection. This is the meaning of Rom. 6:3-5; Matt. 10:32-39 and 7:13-14.

Here is a mighty truth and its exposition will show how defective and delusive is the eschatology of the various churches for many hundreds of years, both in its relation to the saved and the unsaved. In demonstration of the truth of this position we must lay our foundations deep in the word of God. We are not anxious about anything else. Man's approval or disapproval is nothing except as it expresses the mind of Christ.

In the preceding chapter our discussion turned chiefly on the Greek adjective *aiōnios.* In this we will investigate a biblical phrase of somewhat synonymous meaning, and doing so will find ourselves conducted to the same conclusion and with corresponding effect on the traditional teaching of the churches as to the future state. That phrase is *eis ton aiōna,* which is usually translated in A.V. and R.V. "forever", a meaning which it never has, and therefore should in no case be so rendered into English. We have pointed out the fact that the adjective *aiōnios* (translated indifferently "eternal" or "everlasting" in A.V., and "eternal" only in R.V.) is derived from the noun *aiōn* an age, a period of time short or long with clearly marked beginning and end. In the phrase *eis ton aiōna, aiōna* is the accusative singular of aiōn. The word *eis* is a preposition usually rendered

in, into or for. The little word *ton* is the accusative singular, masculine, of the definite article.

Our of the New Testament *aiōn* leads us back to the *olam* of the Old Testament—its equivalent. It is impossible, as already remarked, for any language to get along without words which mark time; and in this respect what the *aiōn* was to the Greeks the *olam* was to the Hebrews. When longer periods of time are involved the idea is expressed by plural forms, or by duplication. The *olam* is employed with or without the prepositions *le* and *ad,* signifying to, or into, also *min,* from. In both A.V. and R.V. the *olam* of the Old Testament is translated "everlasting" or "for ever" which are utterly misleading and confusing, and wholly indefensible from the standpoint of scholarship and of energetical consistency, as we shall soon see. Young invariably translates *olam* as he does *aiōnios* by "age-lasting". So also Browne's Triglott.

In the Greek New Testament we have the noun *aiōn* (age) with its derivative adjective *aiōnios* (age-lasting); but in the Hebrew of the Old Testament we have the noun *olam* with no corresponding adjective, so that the noun has to do double service; i. e., it has to serve as adjective and noun. The Hebrew language is said to be rich in nouns and verbs but deficient in modifiers.

Before going back to investigate the use of olam in the Old Testament let us take a few examples of mistranslations of *aiōn* in the New Testament. First, as to the use of the noun without the preposition and article. Here the A.V. and R.V. have confounded the *aiōn* with *kosmos,* owing to the fact that they usually translate both words by "world". Now *kosmos* is always properly translated "world", but *aiōn* ought never to be so rendered. I am not ignoring Heb. 1:2 and 11:3.

They make Christ say "Lo! I am with always, even unto the end of the world". Matt. 28:20. But what He does say is, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the age (aiōn). The consequence is that the Church, with few exceptions, believes that Christ will not come till the end of the world (which, by the way, is not a biblical expression). But He says He is coming again at the end of the present age; and He spoke of the "age to come", after this has run its course, when He will establish His Millennial Kingdom in power and glory; and when He will reward the faithful and punish the unfaithful among His people as we have seen in 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31.

In Matt. 13:39, the versions make Him say, "The harvest is the end of the world"; but He says "The harvest is the end of the age (*aiōn) ",* meaning, this age of grace. In verse 38 the translation "world" is correct for it is not *aiōn* but *kosmos.* See margin of R.V. In Luke 18:30 it is *aiōn.* We have given only three samples out of many. Were the translators and revisers really

trying to bolster up that sorry tradition of postmillennialism? Their acts would lead one to that conclusion.

Let us now take two samples of the false rendering of the adverbial phrase *eis ton aiōna.* When Christ cursed the fig tree, the type of barren but showy Judaism, they make Him say to the good olive tree (Rom. 11:17), "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *for ever."* But the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:16) did not, and cannot say that. He said, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for the (this) age"-the time limit of the curse. What a decisive exegetical difference this makes both in process and conclusion. But it is only by such, shall we say, deliberate confusion of terms that the illusion of postmillennialism can perpetuate its fictitious existence and wield its enslaving, blighting power. And this remark is true of the traditional eschatology as a whole. Right here it may be opportune to quote some words of Lord Bacon as to the process of logical reasoning. He says:

> ***"The syllogism consists of propositions; propositions of words, and words are tokens, or signs of notions. Now if the very notion of the mind be improperly or overhastily abstracted from the facts, vague and not sufficiently definite, faulty, in short, in many ways, the whole edifice tumbles".***

Before proceeding farther in our discussion I ask the reader to seek grace to apprehend and, if possible, also to progressively comprehend a great Biblical fact, in order to get the correct view point and perspective in this study. It is this:

> ***The grand outlook of the Saints in both Testaments was not on eternity and completely consummated redemption; but on the Messianic Age and its glorious Theocratic Kingdom under the whole heavens. From Adam to Abraham; and from Abraham to Malachi; and from Matthew to John in Patmos, this thought of the Sovereign Rule of the Seed of the woman and of Abraham; this Son of David on David's Throne, fixes the prophetic horizon of futurity and declares in unmistakable terms that there is no peace for the world, and no reward for the saints, till Jesus comes in the glory of His Father and the Holy Angels to found that Kingdom which, because of His rejection by the Jews, was postponed at His first Advent.***

And what is more: The Old Testament prophets and saints, by no fault of theirs, did not see the present dispensation. It was a mystery hid in the mind and plan of God. Their vision was beyond, to the glorious Messianic Kingdom, the time limits of which they did not know.

On the contrary the Church, since the third century, has been so deeply absorbed in the coming eternity that it refuses to see this most pernicious and fatal heresy of post-millenarianism in the history of Christianity.

This great truth not only affects Biblical Eschatology, but the whole range of Biblical Theology. Historical and Systematic Theology for 1600 years have refused to see the facts from this point of view; but have painted a picture of the future according to the carnal fancy of Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene apostacy. And let the fact be remembered and pondered, that Past, Present, and Future, constitute a unity in truth or in error, in God, or in Satan. I cannot be wrong as to the future and right as to the present and the past; and vice versa. The unity of personality demands this. Past and future can only be viewed through the medium of what I am. Fiction here will project and objectify itself there. Hence the necessity of a pure heart, a surrendered will, and a renewed mind. These, however, can only be realized by degree and in fellowship with the Christ as rejected on earth and accepted in heaven.

We will now cite a few passages to show the practical force and utility of this manner of viewing the past, present and future, and specially with reference to its bearing on Biblical Eschatology:

> **"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us *his* flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."** -John 6:47-58.

Here we have *aiōnios zoe* (eternal life) twice, verses 47, 54; and we have also the phrase *eis ton aiōna* (for the age) twice, verses 51, 58. The latter modify and complete the predicate "shall live". Thus we see the synonymous character of the two thoughts. Now the traditional and

orthodox method of treating these words of Christ assumes that He is here speaking and discoursing concerning what English readers understand by the “eternal state” which follows the judgment of the Great White Throne. But this is all wickedly wrong. The subject under discussion here is the same as in Luke 18:18-30; namely, THE AGE TO COME; that period of time after the second advent of Messiah and lying between the judgment of the Bema, 2 Cor. 5:10 (where only the saved appear) and the judgment of the Great White Throne-Rev. 20:11-15; these time points definitely marking the termini of the period; and John tells us that the time between them is 1000 years. Rev. 20:1-6. Strictly speaking there is “a little season” between the end of the 1000 years and the White Throne judgment. Rev. 20:3. Now if this be the correct interpretation it is easy to see its tremendously significant bearing on Biblical Eschatology; and at the same time the delusive falsity and fatality of the traditional interpretation.

We will therefore proceed to establish the fact. In the light of Lord Bacon’s warning let us be mercilessly severe in our definitions. Let us also remember the Jewish expectation of their Messiah and His Kingdom as their one hope. They were right in “the hope” but wrong in their manner of cherishing it. They thought that when Messiah came it would be in glory and irresistible power, and that He would at once break the hated yoke of the Romans and set them free. They never dreamed of a humble, rejected, crucified Messiah; and much less of their need of special moral and spiritual preparation for entering the Messianic Kingdom when the time had come. In short, the priests and people alike were the helpless victims of a false and delusive system of interpretation. And, let me add, this is one cause of the trouble in the Church in the present dispensation. And who but a blind man can fail to see the hand of the Prince of this world behind the whole matter? I Cor. 2:14; John 14:30; 9:39-41.

In the Synoptic Gospels the condition, when once salvation from the guilt of sin has been received, of entering this Messianic Kingdom is utter self-denial, and the sacrifice of everything for the love of Christ and one’s neighbor. Matt. 19:16-30; Mark 10:17-31; Luke 18:18-30 and 10:25-37. But in John’s Gospel, as might be expected, Christ goes deeper and reveals the fact that no man can fulfil such a condition except by a living abiding union with Himself as the Bread of Life. John 6:35-63; 10:1-10. And this union with Him and abiding in Him implies that all other relations in life must, if evil, be abandoned, and if good take a wholly subordinate place. Luke 14:25-35; Jas. 4:4; I John 2:15-17. This means complete separation from the world and deliverance from its enslaving spirit. It means conformity to Christ in life and in death. And this is secured by nothing less than abiding in Him and continually eating His flesh and drinking His blood. In Robinson’s Lexicon of the New Testament I find a couple of remarks to the point in this connection. In his definition of alma (blood)he says:

> ***"Perhaps too 1 John 5:6-8 and especially John 6:53-58, where the phrases to 'eat the flesh' and 'drink blood of Christ', signify to become wholly united and incorporated with Christ, i.e., to imbibe His Spirit and appropriate to oneself all the benefits of His advent, to be wholly conformed to Christ."***

Were the Corinthians and Galatians thus living on the Life-giving Spirit of the Christ? I Cor. 15:45. Only those so living are the wheat to be gathered into the heavenly garner. Matt. 13:30-49; Luke 3:15-17. When Christ revealed to John in Patmos the spiritual condition of the seven representative churches in Asia, both literally and prophetically, did He present a scene of the branches abiding in the vine, or of world wide declension and apostasy? Compare Rev. 2, 3 and Matt. 13; also Heb. 3, 4.

The "fathers" came out of Egypt under the blood of the Passover lamb, and virtually under the blood of Christ, and were owned as the people of God. But they refused to come, by faith, into the place of living union with Jehovah as did Joshua and Caleb. They clung to the place of death (disobedience) spiritually, and therefore had no power to obey God. And when the final test came at Kadesh-Barnea they filled up the measure of their iniquity and God gave them over to die physically and spiritually in the wilderness. They died as they had lived-in a state of spiritual death (relatively), having no fellowship in their spirit with God, no correspondence.

But their position in this state of relative death was not that of the Egyptians, or of other nations generally. They were still God's people. The, death in which the nations are involved is not relative but absolute death. But to this day the "fathers" are in this state of relative death. John 6:49. But how different was and is the case of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? They too died as they had lived. They lived by faith (Hab. 2:4) in fellowship with the living God. Thus God is only really the God of those of His people who live and die in faith. These and these only will share, physically and spiritually, in the first resurrection. He will become `the God' of the others later on. Only those of the saved who live and die in faith by continually eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood will attain to eternal (age-lasting) life in the Messianic Kingdom. Heb. 11:13. He said to the Jews:

> ***Search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have "eternal (age-lasting) life" (in the Messianic Kingdom), and they are they which testify of Me (your Messiah). John 5:39.***

But, like Christians, instead of searching the Scriptures, they searched the traditions of the elders and asked, "Have any of the rulers of the Pharisees believed on Him"? John 7:48. Their faith in man made faith in Christ impossible. That the above is the correct interpretation of John 6:49 and Matt. 22:31-32, is clear from John 6:50 and 11:26; I Cor. 10:1-10. "This is

the bread that came down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die". Now, Peter, James, John and Paul, all ate of that bread and yet every one of them died physically. This proves that He is not talking of physical but of spiritual death; and in the case of the saved not of absolute but of relative death; and not of the life in the eternal state beyond the White Throne judgment, but of age-lasting life in the Millennial-Messianic Kingdom after the Bema Judgment, 2 Cor. 5:10; for He says, "he that eateth of this bread shall live for the (millennial) age". John 6:51, 58; 8:51. Thus the "eternal life" of John 6:47,54; and the "shall live for ever" of John 6:51, 58 are identical expressions, and should be translated "age-lasting life" and "shall live for the age", respectively.

Here we quote again from Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament. In his definition of *Zoe,* he says:

"In the Christian sense of *eternal life, i.e.,* that life of bliss and glory in the Kingdom of God, which awaits *the true disciple of Christ after* the resurrection; so *zoe aiōnios.* Matt. 19:16-17". The italics are mine.

It is significant not only that he defines "eternal life" in this way, but also that he adduces as proof text the question of the Young Ruler. Note also his assertion that this "eternal life" is only for "the true disciples of Christ", and to be entered only "after the resurrection". Thus he distinguishes by implication between eternal life as the gift of free grace, and eternal life as the prize; for every saved man has the former whether true to Christ like the Thessalonians, or untrue like the Corinthians and Galatians. But it is almost certain that Robinson failed to see the real eschatological significance of his own distinction.

Let us now turn from John to Paul:

> ***"Howbeit that for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Christ Jesus might show forth all long suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting".***

He is here not talking of the free gift as in Rom. 6:23, but of the prize which can only be secured through fellowship with Christ in His sufferings; and says that God has appointed him (Paul) to be a pattern to other believers, that by word and deed he might persuade Christians to "put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness", for only thus can those who have received the new birth believe unto life age-lasting (in the Messianic Kingdom). Alas! how few Christians seek honestly to do this. `With the thought of failure among the saved he says:

> ***"Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example. For many (Christians) walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."***

How pathetic the thought that for the great majority of Christians their end is not maturity and Millennial glory, but exclusion, destruction and age-lasting judgment. Alas! How will we preachers and teachers of the Word stand before our judge in that terrible day? Surely Isa. 3:12 is appropriate here. We have tried to save our life from the offence of the Cross, but in doing so we have lost it for the age to come with the consequence that we have exposed ourselves to eternal (age-lasting) judgment. The Master has pictured the true and false servants in Matt. 24:42-51. But thank God for Paul and Peter and James and John. Listen to Paul again:

"But refuse profane and old wives' fables (and much of theology comes under this head), and exercise thyself rather unto Godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come." 1Tim. 4:7-8.

Ungodly believers may have the life that now is and it is true life (zoe), but they have no claim on the life of the age to come. Contrast Gal. 5:19-21; and Matt. 19:27-30. The antithetic Dualism in different classes of believers is very clearly marked here.

Listen to Paul further:

> ***"But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal (age-lasting) life" whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses."*** 1 Tim. 6:11-12.

There is no need of fighting for the free gift. The hand of faith simply reaches out to the God-Man and takes it. Not so, however, with the prize. In verse 19 Paul exhorts the rich in this world's goods who think that by means of their money and social position they know something of real happiness, "to lay hold on the life that is life indeed. "R.V. With such pictures of the Millennium as we have in Isaiah, chapters 52-66, Ezek. 40-48, Psa. 72, Rev. 22, the contrast between this age and that, even on earth, will be extraordinary. But if the glory be so great on the terrestrial side of the Kingdom, what infinite bliss will be the portion of those on the celestial side, those who share in the first resurrection? We can only reply: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man

the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. I Cor. 2:9. True, indeed, “God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit”, but we see through a glass darkly, oh, so darkly. And note the limitation of this coming blessedness *which God hath prepared for them that love Him.* And who are they that love Him? Not all the saved. Only the saved and sanctified, the overcomers, the Lord’s Jewels. Matt. 3:16-17.

In this connection let us look for a moment at the death of Christ: Two views which are complimentary:

1. Objectively and historically: We are disposed in our conception of death to emphasize the physical element, the dissolution of soul and body; and we are in danger of missing the essential factor in the fact. The physical death of Christ was a fact, a necessary fact, but His death was primarily a soul-death. In the circumference of His being He died to physical comfort, to physical pain; but deeper than that, in His soul He died to the world, to sin, to self, and emphatically and fundamentally, He died for and to the Law. He died unto sin once for all and forever. Rom. 6:10. As the Federal Head of the new creation, and the Sin Bearer, both sin and the law had claims on Him, for the strength of sin is the Law. But He died to both. Here we are in Romans 5 and 6. But when He had so died death could not hold Him. Because by dying to sin and the Law He had overcome and abolished death, and therefore rose as Conqueror of sin and death. The relation of the resurrection to the death therefore was that of effect and cause. Note further, and this is vital: When Christ died on the Cross-the consummation of a death process reaching from childhood onwards-the whole human race, past, present and future, died in Him Judicially; and in His resurrection rose with Him potentially. 2 Cor. 5:14; Rom. 5:12-21. The conception of a limited atonement is a mental and moral monstrosity; and in this respect the Confession of Faith is really a confession of Unbelief. But please notice carefully the modifying power of the two adverbs,” Judicially” and “potentially”. Do not read the sentence as if I said “actually”.
2. Subjectively and experimentally: The fact that Christ judicially tasted death for every man does not necessarily compel any individual man to accept that death as endured for him. In this case the logical result is as if Christ had not tasted death for every man. This leads us to ask, What was the purpose of the death of Christ considered as an objective and historical fact, and in its essential physical and spiritual essence? It was: (1) That God in the expression of His infinite love might impart the free gift of eternal life to all who in their hearts believe on Christ as the Sin-Bearer of the world. This presupposes repentance, regeneration and justification. (2) That He might bestow the prize of eternal (age-lasting) life in the Messianic Kingdom on all

who earnestly desire to have Christ by the Holy Spirit live in them to will and to do of God's good pleasure. This implies separation from the world, emancipation from its spirit, having the seed of the word fall into the heart as into prepared soil and bringing forth fruit 30, 60, or 100-fold. It means actual fellowship with Christ in His rejection by men and His acceptance with God. In other words, it means that the very spirit of the death of Christ, the utter self-denial of Christ, shall work in us as it did in Him and thereby secure to all who will a place with Him in the first resurrection, and that "so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into His everlasting (age-lasting) Kingdom. 1 Peter 1:10-11.

Thus to obtain the free gift and yet to despise the prize; that is, not to be willing to pay any price and endure any pain for it, is not only to nullify, temporarily, the purpose of the atonement and thus do despite unto the Spirit of grace, but it must also be regarded ethically and spiritually as an abortion. Heb. 12:6-8. "We which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh". 2 Cor. 4:11. This manifestation is physical, intellectual and spiritual. And this affirmation is not of all Christians, nor of the many, but of the few. Matt. 7:13-14. The vast majority refuse to be delivered unto death for Jesus' sake. John 6:64-68; Luke 13:24-25. Only a few Christians can be said to be "dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God". The converse is true of the many. Matt. 24:12; Gal. 5:19-21; I Cor. 3:1-15. "She (a believer) that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth". I Tim. 5:6. As Paul speaks of carnal and spiritual Christians, so does he speak of dead and living Christians, and the two expressions are synonymous. "If a man (a believer) abide not in Me, (the source of life) he is (by the law of life) cast forth as a branch, and is withered (spiritually); and men gather them, and cast them into the fire and they are burned". John 15:6. Be careful not to carry the figure too far, for if you do you cannot stop short of annihilationism. The fire here is the same as Mark 9:49-50; Heb. 12:28-29; Matt. 3:10-12. Every saved man must have his baptism of fire now in this age, or in the age to come. God is not mocked. Gal. 6:6-8. Only thus can sin's kingship in the soul be destroyed.

The altar sanctifies the gift, but only by fire. Matt. 22:22. This baptism follows full consecration. Rom. 12:1-2. But, like Israel at Kadesh-Barnea, Christians can refuse and reject the will of God, though at terrible cost. Only those who by eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which is a material way of expressing the thought and need of living in spiritual union with Him, the Head of the body, will find the Holy Spirit within them becoming a fountain springing up into everlasting (age-lasting) life. John 4:10-14;.2 Peter 1:10-11. If any man eat (habitually) of this bread, he will live for, or in, the age (to come). John 6:51; Luke 18:28-30. Dead Christians

in this age will continue to be dead Christians in the age to come. Hence Gal. 1:4; 2 Peter 1:4. And dead Christians cannot have glorified bodies. The way to be and continue a dead Christian is to keep on sowing to the flesh. Gal. 6:6-8. Such can never glory in the Cross of Christ. Gal. 6:14. Christ said to the lawyer: “This do and thou shalt live”. Luke 10:28. The “shalt live” here, and the “shall live for, or in, the age (to come)” of John 6:51 are identical. “Blessed and holy is he that (as a result of obedience and living union with Christ) hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they (and they only) shall (in the age to come) be priests of God and of Christ and shall reign with Him a thousand years”. Rev. 20:6; 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Worldly, carnal Christians can not be either “blessed” or “holy” in this sense. Blessedness and holiness are inseparable now and in the age to come, and in the Kingdom of God as then realized. Heb. 12:14; John 12:23-26.

I believe that from the standpoint of the New Testament the two great Biblical facts of Synthetic and Antithetic Dualism in the Church of God on earth, with their logical and ethical implications, are fully established. The facts, however, will become more and more apparent, and their spiritual significance more decisive and impressive with every step forward to the end of the book.

We will now go to the Old Testament and look for our facts there; and owing to the organic nature of the Scriptures it may be assumed as an axiom that there can be nothing explicitly affirmed in the New Testament that is not implicitly contained in the Old. And we shall not only find the truth for which we are contending in the O. T., but we shall find it there in a glorious process of unfoldment. The unbelief of the Jews stopped the process in that age just as the unbelief of the Church has done in this age. The victories of the Book of Joshua in that dispensation and those of the Acts of the Apostles in this should have continued till the commission was executed and the goal reached. But in both cases the Holy Spirit not only gave the commission but He foretold the failure, apostasy, and rejection. Deut. 28; and Rev. 2; 3.

It may surprise the reader to be told that the Old Testament has far more to say about the Age to Come and its glory than the New. It is a fact nevertheless. The Patriarchs and Prophets of that Age knew nothing of the present age, nor yet of the Eternity which lies beyond the Age to Come. They were wholly occupied with the latter and did not know how long it might last. Placing various prophecies side by side, however, they could easily perceive from passages like Isa. 65:17,22 that the Age to come, so far as the earth and its people were concerned belonged to the sphere of things temporal.

THE HEBREW "OLAM".

This noun is derived from the verb *alam,* to hide, to conceal. Psa. 90:8; Isa. 58:7. Gesenius defines it thus:

> ***"What is hidden: specially hidden time, long: the beginning or end of which is either uncertain or else not defined: eternity, perpetuity. It is used of time long past, antiquity."***

There is an apparent inconsistency here. He speaks of the olam as a period of time, as having a beginning and end, but of which the one or the other may be "uncertain or else not defined". That statement is all right. But notice what follows: with a semicolon after "defined" he adds, eternity. Surely that is an illogical and indefensible process. Eternity proper as understood in English is without beginning or end. How can he effect the passage from the finite to the infinite except by simply making an assertion which the facts of the primary definition will not allow. This is the way all error creeps in, and once in there is the piper to pay in order to drive it out.

Of course it is quite proper to speak of eternity past and eternity future. But surely there is an unbridgeable gulf between past eternity and antiquity. So is there a like difference between the age to come and future eternity. Among the passages cited by Gesenius under this head are Amos 9:11; Mic. 7:14; Isa. 63:9; Deut. 32:7; Gen. 6:4; I Sam. 27:8; Psa. 26:5; Pro. 8:11; Isa. 42:14; Isa. 58:12; 61:4. Let us look at some of them.

Amos 9:11. This is a prophecy that after the children of Israel have been chastened for their sins, the nation shall again come together at the second advent of Christ, and the coming glory will be like that in the days of old (olam); that is, as it was in the days of David and Solomon, only better. Mic. 7:11-14 is the same. There is no reference to eternity. Isa. 63:9: He bare them and carried them all the days of old (olam). This refers to Jehovah's kindness to Israel when He brought them out of Egypt and placed them in the land of Canaan.

So in Deut. 32:7; Gen. 6:4. In Gen. 6:3, "Olam" is rendered "always." Psa. 25:6 is the same as Deut. 32:7; Isa. 42:14: "I have *long time* (olam) holden my peace." This, as Gesenius says, refers to the Babylonian captivity.

The only place where eternity (past) seems to be in view is Pro. 8:23; and even here, as far as this text is concerned, it is sufficient to render, "I was set up before the world was created."

The Editor of Bengel's Gnomon (Matt. 25:42-46) says:

> ***"The Bible has no metaphysical distinctions, therefore it has no one word to express eternity."***

This is equivalent to saying that neither the *olam* of the O.T. nor the *aiōn* of the N. T. is used with reference to eternity; and this is all I contend for.

Dr. Tregelles (editor of Gesenius) takes him to task for his translation of Dan. 9:24, where the prophet speaks of “everlasting righteousness”. Gesenius makes it refer to the past, the righteousness of the fathers; while Tregelles affirms it is to be future, and in this he is right.

But what future? Here is what he says:

> ***“It hardly need be pointed out to any Christian that this passage in Daniel can have no such meaning as this; it speaks of the everlasting righteousness to be brought in through the atonement of Christ.”***

But Tregelles makes it refer to eternity future which is not true. The passage does not refer merely to What Christ procured by His holy life and vicarious death; but to the actual establishment of that righteousness in the Messianic-Millennial Kingdom, and as definitely embodied in the domestic, social, and national life of Israel, while yet in the limits of time. This will not be true of the Gentile nations as of Israel during that period. The declaration is for the comfort of Daniel’s people, and has no reference to eternity except by implication. We might carry this criticism of the Lexicons, and likewise of the commentaries, much further if space permitted.

Let us look briefly into R. B. Girdlestone’s HEBREW SYNONYMS: In Chap. 30, and under the heading Eternal, Everlasting, The Age to Come, he begins beautifully:

> ***“The Old Testament words representing duration, and their Greek equivalents, call for the most careful consideration in consequence of the fact that the whole revelation of man’s future destiny must depend to some extent upon their accurate interpretation.”***

That is well and truly put. But it is one thing to see a general principle and quite another to accurately apply that principle to particular cases. We all fail here, and often to the irreparable injury of our selves and our fellow men. This work of Girdlestone is of exceeding great value to the Bible student; but in the realm of eschatology he has followed the beaten path altogether too closely.

Let us note a few examples of this. Under the definition of the Hebrew *ad* he refers to the Greek phrase “*eis to telos,”* and says:

> ***“Three times in the New Testament we read that, he that endureth to the end (eis telos) shall be saved. By this we are to understand that he who holds on fast through tribulation, without wavering, shall ultimately find God to be his deliverer.”***

Not so. The man who holds on, endures, is the man who, like Joshua and Caleb in the wilderness, is finding God a deliverer every hour as he moves towards the telos, the goal, and there receives the prize. See Paul, Phil. 3:7-14. The believer has his daily choice of two things:-to abide in Christ (by a continuous surrender of his will to God) and then, “bear more fruit,” and “much fruit;” and have that fruit unto holiness and the end (telos) everlasting (Millennial) life. John 15:1-1 0; Rom. 6:22; or, by preferring his own will to God’s will, become unfruitful and be cut off and withered and cast into the fire; because the wages of sin is both physical and Spiritual death. John 15:6; Rom. 6:23; 8:13. In other words, he must press on through the wilderness and entering Canaan begin to possess his possessions; or he must back-slide and die in the wilderness and thus forfeit all claim on the first resurrection and the glory of the Messianic Kingdom. Obadiah 17; Deut. 6:23; Heb. 4:1.

On page 502 he says: “In Isa. 60:15, *Olam* is rendered eternal, “I will make thee an eternal joy,” and he assumes that the prophet has eternity in view, whereas the reference is to the terrestrial glory of Israel during the thousand years; and aiōnios, or olam, should here be rendered age-lasting. Then he quotes Psa. 12:7; “God preserves the righteous for ever,” and assumes that this is correct, when the reference is to the same Messianic Age and should be rendered, “God preserves the righteous for the age (to come) “. Compare Luke 18:28-30; John 6:58; 8:51; Matt. 13:43, 49; 1 Tim. 6:12. He quotes Psa. 61:4; 73:26; 81:15; 112:6; 125:2; Ecc. 3:14; Isa. 40:8; 51:6; Dan. 7:18; and takes it for granted that “for ever” has exclusive reference to future eternity, whereas in every case the writer has his mind on the Messianic Millennial Kingdom, or some nearer period of time.

Before giving the next quotation from Girdlestone let the reader reflect on the fact, that, with the probable exception of Pro. 8:23; the passages we have cited from those he adduces as example, have no reference to eternity, because the outlook of Prophets and Patriarchs was exclusively confined to Israel’s Golden Age, when the Messiah shall sit as a Priest-King on the throne of His father David. Psalms 2; 45; 72; 110. Recall also the first sentence we quoted from his book and then read the following from page 503

> ***"In the passages quoted which are a considerable proportion and a fair specimen of the whole, the LXX rendering is usually aiōnios, or eis ton aiōna; these Greek phrases when they appear in the N. T. must be interpreted in accordance with the word Olam. They give a conception which though negative, is sufficiently clear. Eternity is endlessness; and this idea is only qualified by the nature of the object to which it is applied, or by the direct word of God. When applied to things physical it is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth-When the word is applied to man's future destiny after the resurrection, and after the passing away of all things physical, we do right (unless there be some revelation to the contrary) to give it the sense of endlessness, without any limitation".***

This paragraph completely nullifies the gracious concession he made at the beginning of the chapter. He has already laid down the general principle as to the need of great care in the interpretation of eschatological terms; and then, when face to face with the facts, he so construes them as to abandon the principle, and especially where the specific application of the principle might have turned darkness Into light. Read again, if there be any doubt, our discussion of the term *aiōnios* in Chap. II.

Note a few remarks on the above quotation:

1. He says the meaning of the Greek adjective *aiōnios* and the phrase *eis ton aiōna* must be interpreted in accordance with the word *olam.* That is, the Hebrew determines the Greek, because it is the language of God's revelation to Israel, and not contrary-wise. This is all right. But he has not yet decided the prime question; namely, what is the true definition of the Hebrew *olam?* From the beginning of his discussion he has missed the trail. He has cited about a score of passages where the word in question occurs, and taken it for granted that in practically every case it is truly rendered in our A. V. But this is begging the very question at issue. It is the translation that I challenge, and that especially on exegetical grounds. It is as if out of twenty men nineteen had the unmistakable marks of the Englishman and only one those of the Frenchman, and some one should try to convince us that they were all Frenchmen.

He says:

"When applied to things physical it is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth."

I freely grant the deduction. Let us take a passage to illustrate his meaning. In Gen. 49:26 Jacob says to Joseph:

"The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting (olam) hills".

His reasoning is to the effect that as the heaven and earth are to pass away, therefore the "hills" must pass, and on that account they cannot be everlasting. The temporal nature of the hills necessitates a limitation of the adjective. That is good logic. Wherein then is he wrong? He errs thrice. (1) Since the English word "everlasting" has the idea of endlessness, eternal, why does he not challenge the translation and insist that, in this case at least, olam should be rendered into idiomatic English by age-lasting, or age-abiding, for when thus used we see that the adjective refers to temporal things and limited periods of time; and thus we harmonize etymology and exegesis. We have no more right to apply the term everlasting to "hills" than to sunflowers.

(2) He ignores the fact that the age, aiōn, or olam, to follow the present lies this side of eternity, and that the present heaven and earth will continue through that age. He assumes that the "age to come" is the eternal state beyond the White Throne judgment; whereas it is wholly on this side of that great event and within the limits of temporal existence so far at least as the earth is concerned. We have already proven this in our discussion of Luke 18:28-30; and will yet give fuller proof.

My point is this: Why apply to the Hebrew adjective (olam) in the present age a principle of limitation guaranteed by revelation and deny the application of the same principle to the same word in the age to come when the natural phenomena of heaven and earth, hills and mountains, seed time and harvest, summer and winter, continue substantially as they are in this and past ages? The only way that post-millenarians can plausibly evade the inconsistency is to deny that between the present, or 6th age, in the unfoldment of God's Plan of the Ages, and future eternity, there is another, a 7th age, an age of Millennial blessedness and while men on the earth are still in the flesh. But to do this is to oppose the explicit teaching of Patriarchs and Prophets as well as of Christ and His Apostles. In other words it is to substitute the Nicaean Theology of the so called "fathers" of the Church, for the Evangelical Theology of the inspired founders of Christianity. See the quotation from Dean Stanley in the introduction.

(3) He affirms that where olam is applied to man's future destiny after the resurrection we are "to give it the sense of endlessness without limitation."

Very well: Grant it and see how the assumption will work. We have proven from Scripture that Carnal believers at and after the resurrection will be excluded from the Millennial Kingdom. Gal. 5:19-21; 2 Cor. 12:19-21; Heb. 12:14. He says the meaning of olam is eternal, everlasting, endlessness, and that it must determine the force of the Greek aiōnios. Grant this also. What then? Simply that according to Christ's own teaching a believer in

actual possession of the gift of eternal life can find his abiding portion in everlasting hell-fire. Matt. 18:8-9; 7:13-14. If so all carnal believers are eternally lost. We have proven also that the eternal judgment of Heb. 6:1-8 is threatened to believers. Perhaps when our author discovers his own peril and that of believers generally he will be glad to give up man's traditional fiction for God's statement of immutable fact.

The ground of his erroneous definition of olam and his false exegesis is the unproven and unprovable assumption that there is only one resurrection, and that at the end of the world when heaven and earth pass away. This, however, is only one of a concatenated series of assumptions which go to constitute, in a large measure, the very warp and woof of traditional theology, and especially of traditional eschatology. The leaven of unrighteousness pervades and saturates the whole structure of Modern Christianity as an anomalous survival of Latin Christianity. As a matter of imperishable fact there are two resurrections-one at the second coming of Christ, and the beginning of the Millennium; and the other at its end when the present heaven and earth pass away. These two pivotal events stand out in contrast and yet in unity as parts of one system as clearly as do the Old and New Testaments, as records of God's working in Creation and Redemption.

I quote again:

"The adjective aiōnios is used more than forty times in the N. T. with respect to eternal life, which is regarded partly as a present gift, partly as a promise for the future secured to all disciples of Christ." page 504.

Here he follows closely the traditional path which ignores one of the most important distinctions in the Bible-that between the free gift of eternal life and the prize of eternal life. Surely the thing for which Paul urged Timothy to contend (1 Tim. 6:12) was not the thing he received when he became a Christian. If it were would Paul not rather have urged him to hold on to what he already had. John says, "This is the promise which He hath promised us, even eternal life (life in the Messianic Kingdom) ". The International Commentary says that the phrase "Eternal Life" in our Lord's Day was synonymous with Messiah's Kingdom. And of this there can be no doubt. But the writer being a postmillenarian does not see the real significance of his own remark. Bishop Swete says the phrase "Eternal Life" first appears in Dan. 12:2. But when he comes to interpret it and look at it in the light of Christ's talk with the Rich Young Ruler he completely misses the mark.

Let us analyse the quotation from Mr. Girdlestone as given above:

Here he assumes **(1)** that "eternal life" as a present gift and a future realization are simply two phases of one and the same thought; whereas

one is the free gift of God to naked faith, and the other is the prize to be won by conflict, even to soul agony and the loss of all that the natural heart counts precious. Luke 13:23-24. If we suffer with Him we shall reign with Him-not otherwise. 2 Tim. 2:10-13. The Young Ruler refused to go thus far. His is a typical case. Bishop Swete following Bengel says we are not to infer that because Christ adopted this method of dealing with this particular enquirer that the Saviour meant thereby to affirm a general principle applicable to all. But he would not have said this if he had known the exact meaning of the Young Ruler's question. "Except a man forsake all that he hath he cannot be My disciple" is of universal application when the Messianic Kingdom is in view, and is specially applicable to preachers and bishops. Then you say, "Few will get in". That is the very thing the Christ affirms, and which the Church refuses to believe and teach.

He assumes **(2)** that the outlook on eternal life as properly understood in Luke 18:18-30, and many like passages, is identical with the outlook on the Eternal State beyond the Great White Throne judgment, whereas it is clearly Millennial when, viewed in the light of prophecy and sound exegesis.

He assumes **(3)** that this eternal life which was the subject under discussion in the conversation of the Young Ruler with Christ is sure to all believers, all the saved, when on the contrary is only sure to the righteous, the holy, those who forsake all to follow the Master. Matt. 13:49; Heb. 12:14; Gal. 5:19-21; Luke 18:18-30.

I am hopeful that by this time the intelligent and unbiased reader is fully convinced that so far as Biblical Eschatology is concerned Christian Scholarship has pathetically failed in its illuminating purpose and solemn mission, and has left the people groping in the darkness of the Middle Ages. This is surely a crime against truth and righteousness, against Humanity and God. We have some idea of the terrific judgment of the Jewish people, and especially their leaders, as the result of false teaching-false interpretation of God's Word. Then, since in the mercy of God through Christ much more light is given in this age, will not the people, and especially the accredited teachers, be correspondingly responsible, and subject to and deserving of a much severer penalty. This is the explicit teaching of the Bible. Heb. 2:1-3; Luke 12:46-48; 1 Cor. 4:2. The fear of being found unfaithful in That Great Day, quite as much as the love of truth and righteousness, makes me cling tenaciously, amid storm and conflict, to the narrow way, the way marked and made sacred by the foot-prints of the Son of Man. It will be openly demonstrated in the judgment of believers at the Bema (2 Cor. 5:10), just as effectually and solemnly as in the judgment of sinners a thousand years later at the Great White Throne (Rev. 20:11-15), that God is no respecter of persons and that He is not mocked. Gal. 6:7. The Christian who enters upon and wilfully follows the easy path of

conformity to the world and thinks that he is safe because he can plead the blood of Christ to cover his sins, is mocking God; and that more daringly than the thief, the drunkard, or the harlot. In the light of reason and revelation such a man ought to reap as he sows.

Let us now, and briefly, turn to the Word for a little further light on this momentous and ever pregnant question of human destiny. The worth of theology, of ethics, and all humanitarian theories, must prove their essential claims to recognition by being able to stand unabashed in the awful white light of God's Holy Word when consistently interpreted and faithfully applied. If any where and at any time in his life, surely here, mortal man should remove his hat, bow his head, and worship as one consciously treading on holy ground. Here, if any where, tradition, sectarian bias, antiquated scholarship, and all exegetical parleying should be regarded as unclean and insufferable intruders. The aim of Biblical Science quite as truly as any natural science, say anatomy, is to discover facts and their relations and arrange them systematically and concisely for convenient practical use. Utility is the immediate goal.

The Biblical use of *olam*.

In Gen. 6:3; 1 Chr. 16:15, it is translated "always". "My Spirit shall not always strive with man". If, as the authorities maintain, its one abiding meaning is eternal, or eternity, why did the translators not render it so, and read, "My Spirit shall not strive eternally with man?" If they answer that that would not express the thought of the writer, I reply that this is just what I am contending for: namely, that we should seek the aim of the writer, and in our translation preserve his thought as nearly as possible. But the difficulty is that postmillennialism compels its votaries to put a construction on the language of Scripture which substitutes another meaning for the true one. For example, as already noted, Christ says, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the age," this age; but the translators make Him say, "unto the end of the world". Matt. 28:20. The servant who says:

"I love my master, my wife and my children; I will not go out free. Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, and to the door post; and his master shall bore his ears through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever" (olam).

Why, in the interest of truth and common sense, did they not say: "and he shall serve him as long as he lives." One might think from the A. V. that the institution of human slavery was going to extend its evil influence into the eternal state, even into the purity and freedom of heaven. We find the same confusion of terms in 1. Sam. 1:22:

"But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband, I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before -the Lord and there abide for ever (olam). See ver. 28.

As in Gen. 49:26, the force of the adjective was limited by the fact that the hills must pass away; so here by the fact that man is mortal.

It may be said of God that He is everlasting; and of the hills that they are age-lasting, but neither term is applicable to man in his present state.

We will now take another use of the word *olam* which is of vital importance in its bearing on Biblical Eschatology. One of the essential factors in the Abrahamic Covenant was the promise of the land. No one element in the Covenant is more emphasized than this. The promise is repeated seven times. The Holy Spirit foresaw that post-millenarians would spiritualize this Covenant so as to nullify its prophetic significance, and therefore took this precaution to safe guard the truth by repetition, also by the oath. Gen. 22:15-18; Heb. 6:13-18.

"And Jehovah said unto Abram after that Lot was separated from him, lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land that thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever (olam)." Gen. 13:15.

In Gen. 15:18, the land is geographically defined as from the Nile to the Euphrates. Now we want to know definitely the meaning of olam in this and correlated passages; and knowing that inquire what light it throws on what we may call the science of Biblical Eschatology.

Note carefully:

1. The land is promised to Abraham personally as well as to his seed. Gen. 12:1-3; 13:15; 15:18.
2. He never got possession of any part of it during his life time except the field and the cave which he bought of Ephron the Hittite for four hundred shekels of silver. Gen. 23:1-20. Abraham regarded himself as a stranger in the land. Gen. 23:4; Heb. 11:8-10.
3. The proto-martyr Stephen and the Apostle of the Gentiles testify that the promise still holds good. Acts 7:5; Rom. 4:13; Heb. 6:11-19; with Gen. 22:11-18.
4. The time when the promise is fulfilled is the time when the human family is still divided into nations and therefore must be this side of the eternal state. Gen. 22:18. This promise cannot be fulfilled through the ministry of the Church, for God's favor to the Gentile nations is through restored and converted Israel, and through the righteous government of David's throne and when that throne is occupied by

David's Greater Son. Amos 9:11-15; Acts 15:12-17; Luke 1:30-33; Matt. 1:1; Rom. 4:13; 11:13-32.

5. Therefore the Abrahamic Covenant must be literally interpreted; and in the light of this interpretation we know that at no period in the History of Israel, even in the days of David and Solomon, was the nation in possession of all the land from the river Nile to the river Euphrates; and at the present time that land is in possession of the "worst of the heathen"-the Turks. Ezek. 30:1-7; 36:21-38.

I Kings 4:21 was a little foretaste. The reigns of David and Solomon were typical and prophetic. Psalms 45; 72; 110; 2 Sam. 7.

6. The promise of the land to Abraham and his seed, and the promise of the Kingdom-to David (2 Sam. 7) cannot be fulfilled in the eternal state for the same reason already given by Mr. Girdlestone. I will repeat that part of the quotation which is pertinent to the subject in hand. He says:

> ***"When applied to things physical it (olam) is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth."***

That is, the Hebrew *olam* when applied to things physical, like hills and mountains, cannot be translated everlasting, neither, by implication, can it be translated or ever, which is the equivalent of everlasting. Therefore since the words everlasting and for ever cannot be applied to "hills", because they must pass away, neither can they be applied to that portion of the land promised to Abraham for the same reason, because the land, as now constituted, must, as truly as the hills, pass away to make room for the new earth. Isa. 65:17; Rom. 8:19-23. We thus see that on the grounds of etymology and exegetical necessity we are obliged to place definite limits, a quo and ad quem, to the Hebrew olam. But inasmuch as the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants constitute the center and also the immediate goal of the Old Testament and of the New, we are compelled to find the eschatological horizon of both Testaments confined almost entirely to the olam as just now defined and located.

And if this be granted, as it must where there is honest dealing with the Word of God, it follows that the Hebrew olam whether used as noun or adjective, and in the singular, is employed only as the designation and measure of definitely limited periods of time. And in the same manner, because of this affinity and interdependence, we infer that the same limitation applies to the Greek noun aiōn, and its cognate adjective, aiōnios. I need hardly point out the tremendous effect of this conclusion in its bearing on Biblical Interpretation, and specifically on Biblical Eschatology.

The inevitable conclusion, based solidly on the above Biblical facts, which are only samples of scores of the same evidential significance and value, is approximately this: That the traditional advocates of eternal punishment are obliged to surrender from 80 to 90 % of their proof texts, their working capital. Will any honest Bible student with the facts before him dare to deny it. And, more than that, they are obliged to confess that a very large proportion of those Scriptures which they have supposed to reveal the eternal peril of the sinner, on the contrary actually reveal the age-lasting peril of their own souls. If a Christian were trying to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ, and out of one hundred Scriptures quoted ninety were irrelevant, I would feel it my duty to protest, and also to insist that Scripture doctrine must be Scripturally supported and legitimately demonstrated. This is why I discriminate between the "traditional" and the real.

7. It is clearly evident from numerous Scriptures that Abraham and the "heirs of the same promise," some already deceased, and others living on the earth, must at the appointed hour inherit together; that is, at one and the same time. In short, there can be no fulfilment of the promises, in accordance with the terms and specifications of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants, except in and through the resurrection of the dead, and the conversion of the living; and since there can be no resurrection of the dead apart from the Second Advent of the Christ in Glory, we are obliged to infer by deduction that the Second Coming must be premillennial; and this conclusion is overwhelmingly confirmed by an inductive study of the Word. Thus we conclude that the Covenant with Abraham was not, and is not, an everlasting Covenant at all, but an age-lasting covenant, a covenant for the age to come. Of course its final issue is everlasting, eternal blessedness. But this farther eschatological horizon is not within the vision of Prophets and Apostles except occasionally, incidently, or by implication. Therein we find the reason for the emphasis which Paul placed on the (first) resurrection. Acts 17:18; 17:32; 23:6; 24:15,21; Phil. 3:10-11. Compare Rev. 20:6; Luke 20:35; 21:36.

To Paul "the hope of the first resurrection" was the full, literal, and spiritual realization of the unsearchable riches of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants, and of the New Covenant through the shed blood of the Son of God, the latter being the basis and medium through which they come into full effect.

We will take one more instance of the use of the *olam* and this of a negative character:

"And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel at which the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house. When I

begin I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever (olam) for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever (olam). 1 Sam. 3:11; comp. 1 Sam. 2:27-32.

Both the A.V. and R.V. would lead us to believe that Eli and his sons are eternally lost, whereas the declaration is to the effect that they are to be excluded from Messiah's Millennial Kingdom, and the implication is that at the end of that period they will be restored to the favor of God. And this exegesis harmonizes with John 6:49; Gal. 5:19-21; Matt. 5:21-26; Rev. 20:5; Matt. 18:8-9.

Over against this sentence on Eli and his family read the following:

"And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind; and he shall walk before mine Anointed (Jesus Christ) for ever (for the age to come). 1 Sam. 2:35.

Who can this priest be who is to take the place of Eli in the Messianic-Millennial Age? He is Zadok. See Ezek. 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11; Ex. 32:25-19.

Surely the most superficial examination of the text and context demonstrates that the above passages from Samuel and Ezekiel have nothing to do with the Eternal State, but are confined wholly within the Millennial Age. Surely no sensible person thinks for a moment that bloody sacrifices will be offered in the Eternal State after sin and suffering have been absolutely abolished from the New Heaven and Earth. See Ezek. 45:9-25; 43:7; Rev. 20:1-6; 21:1-7.

We may conclude this chapter by a well grounded and far reaching generalization: Namely, The words *eternal, everlasting* and *for ever,* except when they apply to God and the free gift of eternal life, ought to be banished from our Bibles and Lexicons with the least possible delay. Let it not be overlooked, however, that so far we have not touched the discussion of the terms *olam* and *aiōn* in their plural and duplicated forms.

These carry us far beyond the limit of the age to come. Whether or not they convey the idea of absolute endlessness in every case is not so easy to determine. Thus: "To Him that liveth unto the ages of the ages (eis tous aioonas toon aiōnoon). Rev. 1:6; 4:9-10; 22:5. That God's existence is absolutely eternal there is no doubt. The point is as to whether the Greek Language, even by means of these plural and duplicated forms, can express that conception, if we may thus speak of that which is inconceivable while yet believable. "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever (eis aioonas aioonoon) ". Rev. 14:11. I will not dare, with present light, to bate one jot from the terrible force of that

expression. We may, however, keep in mind two facts: **1-**This declaration has reference to a special form of sin-taking the mark of the Anti-Christ. Matt. 12:31-32 seems to convey the same idea. This fact greatly limits the comprehension of the term. **2-**We have only a partial revelation of the farther eschatological horizon, just as in the age of Moses and the Law they had only a partial revelation of the nearer eschatological horizon. And as the present age of Grace brought all needed light on the nearer, so will the advent of the age to come bring a full unfolding of all the facts connected with the more distant. In the meantime let us be careful not to confound and confuse the two as we now know them, at least, may know them.

The conclusion to which we now come as a result of our studies so for may be expressed thus: For those who truly love God and His Word, and are determined at any cost to walk in the footsteps of the Christ (Luke 14:25-35), there is the assurance that even in this present life sin's power in the heart shall be completely broken and the love of truth and righteousness shall be there enthroned; and that at death all consciousness of the subjective dualism with its implied limitations and restrictions shall for ever be dissolved; and that then the gift and the prize shall be merged in the divine synthesis of consummated redemption, when the subjects of the first resurrection will enter into the fathomless bliss of the Messianic Kingdom and that on its celestial side.

"Oh, bliss of the purified! bliss of the free!
I plunge in the crimson tide opened for me;
O'er sin and uncleanness exulting I stand,
And point to the print of the nails in His hand".

But for all others of the saved who like the Rich Young Ruler refuse to put all on the altar and meet the conditions dictated equally by the mercy and holiness of God, the fact, and the consciousness of the fact, of the antithetic dualism will continue into and through the intermediate state and be an abiding source of unrest and distress. And be it remembered that this is only the subjective side of the intermediate state. Such a subjective condition must have an objective environment to match it. The inner and the outer are both embodied in the very solemn teaching of Christ to His own disciples as we find it in Matt. 18:1-9; 25:30. If God's people could only be brought to see this very solemnizing truth what a tremendous change it would make in their mode of living and in their relation to the Kingdom of God in general. That which will make the teaching of this book offensive to the average Christian of this wicked generation cannot be its lack of Scriptural support; but the fact that it exposes the falsity of established religious opinions, and especially that it puts a disagreeable barrier in the way of the free and licentious indulgence of the flesh. But is not the utter destruction of the flesh in God's people one of the beneficent purposes of the Plan of Redemption in its fullest

significance and widest sweep? To implicitly teach, as do Calvinism, Arminianism, Lutheranism, and Roman Catholicism, that because of the fact that the grace of God abounds through the power of Calvary, the believer can, with impunity, indulge the evil propensities of his fallen nature on the antinomian assumption that the redemption in Christ makes it possible to God's power and agreeable to His holiness to overlook and even wink at the wilful sins of Christians, is to ignore the analogy between Israel and the Church, to trifle with the awful facts of human destiny, and even to challenge the sovereign rights and eternal prerogatives of the Living God.

CHAPTER 4:
A REVOLUTION IN ESCHATOLOGY.

> ***"The Holy Spirit often dwells in sanctifying power where He does not dwell as an illuminating power in the deep things of God, and time embalms the errors it does not destroy, and creeds are propagated from father to son."*** Nathaniel West.
> ***"Nevertheless, as Cato the Censor said, That the Romans were like sheep, for that a man were better drive a flock of them, than one of them; for in a flock if you could get some few go right the rest would follow."*** Bacon.

Will the "***old bottles***" of the traditional theology hold the new wine generated by the operation of the Holy Spirit working in and through the "***new things***" brought forth from the inexhaustible treasury of Holy Writ? They could not when the Son of Man taught on earth, nor can they today. But spite of this fact Luke was able to marshal in stately array his "***many infallible proofs***", and it is very probable that Theophilus was able to drink deeply from this new well of salvation.

It is not easy for religious people to accept and appreciate the flavor of the "***new wine***" when they have long been accustomed to the old wine of traditionalism. They still say, "***The old is better***". Viewed historically it seems to have been vastly easier and much more congenial to religious people to fight sanctifying truth than to oppose and expose the consecrated conventionalities of sanctified error.

So far as we have gone in the three chapters already covered we have come to some very important conclusions, whatever the reader may think as to their truth or falsity in relation to the tremendous subject of Biblical Eschatology, and in refutation of traditional theories.

A new and astonishing interpretation of two well-known portions of God's word.

But one object in what has already been written is to prepare the way for a new and astonishing interpretation of two well-known portions of God's word; and for a still more astonishing conclusion based on said passages. At no point in the book will the reader's intellectual, moral and spiritual resources be more severely taxed than in the present chapter. But at the same time it is equally true that in no part of the book is our position supported by a more plenteous and diversified array of unassailable Scriptural proof. But just as Luke's "***many infallible proofs***" (Acts 1:3) had absolutely no weight with the typical Jew; so is it almost certain that the following procession of Scriptural passages and heir organic cohesion and structural correlation will seem like just so much insufferable nonsense to the average Christian of the easy-going, self-indulgent Laodiceanism of these deeply intoxicated and hilarious days. Nevertheless, we feel sure that there will be not a few ungowned, unmitered, and unheralded lovers of truth, who, however they may be shocked at the first reading, will read a second time, and a third, and then, with bowed head as in the presence of God, exclaim, "It is true, the argument is logical, the exegesis is Scriptural, the conclusion is unassailable, and the writer's thesis is established!"

The first of the two passages referred to is as follows:

> ***"There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."*** Luke 16:19-31.

The traditional, or orthodox interpretation of this Scripture says this Rich Man was a man of the world, a sinner among sinners, that he has gone to hell and is lost for the endless ages of eternity.

On the contrary we affirm that he was a son of Abraham, an actual member of the Jewish commonwealth, though a selfish one; that after his decease he went to the Hadean world (in the bowels of the earth) and into that part of it known in the Scriptures as Gehenna that he is there today in full possession of all his rational and moral powers; that a time will come when he shall have served out the sentence of judgment imposed on him by his Holy judge; that then he shall come forth and take his place among the redeemed in glory. Yes, yes, I hear the orthodox exclaim, "Purgatory! Purgatory!" "Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live." But invective is not argument, and the mandate of conventionality cannot silence the voice of God in the breast of any man to whom truth and righteousness are dearer than the plaudits of the crowd.

We will not attempt any demonstration of the truth of our solution just at present; but we would ask the lover of traditionalism what authority he has for his bold assumption that this Rich Man is eternally lost? Does the narrative say so? Does any portion of the Bible say so? or does it warrant such a conclusion? No. Then the very best that can be said on the orthodox side, after a careful reading is that the Word of God neither affirms nor denies in regard to the finality or non-finality of his position and state in the Hadean world.

The other portion reads thus:

> ***"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."*** Dan. 12:2.

The traditional view says this is the final judgment of saved and unsaved, and that the permanent state of each is here unalterably and eternally fixed. Again in the name of sound exegesis and in the interest of truth and righteousness we must dissent, and affirm that the facts of the case do not warrant any such conclusion. Sinners are not present at this judgment scene in any sense. We are here dealing with the nearer eschatological horizon, and that only. The case and doom of the sinner lies on the distant horizon in the vista of futurity.

Now for the still more astonishing conclusion based on these two interpretations.

It is this:

Since the beginning of Christianity down to the present day, the vast majority of the saved (I am not including mere professors) have died in unbelief and sin, and have gone, and are still going, at death, to the same Hadean locality as the Rich Man of the narrative; and many of them to a lower depth and to a deeper darkness because of fuller light and greater sin.

I am aware that in the light of the darkness (Matt. 6:23) of historical theology this statement will seem to the majority of Church people as a senseless perversion of truth. But it will be admitted that this was the condition of things in Judaism prior to and at the first advent of the Christ. And it is equally apparent that His blameless life and matchless teaching had no effect in arresting the downward momentum of the general mass both politically and religiously; but rather accelerated it. What veritable incarnations of malice, of hatred and general depravity were those "priests, scribes and Pharisees"; and yet through devotion to conventionality the blinded masses followed them recklessly to their awful doom. The stunning words of the Master, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," only intensified their hatred and deepened their guilt. Genuine Protestantism has no doubt that what we have affirmed of Christians generally is woefully

true of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches so-called. And can any honest Bible student deny, or doubt, that the exposures and threats of the Risen Christ contained in the addresses to the “Seven Churches in Asia” are as applicable generally to Protestantism as to them. The difference is not of kind but only of degree.

We will now examine briefly Dan. 12:2.

This Scripture has afforded no end of perplexity to commentators and exegetes generally. They have flustered and floundered hopelessly in an intricate maze of baseless hypotheses, refusing to dig deep enough to discover that beneath the foundations of traditionalism there were certain subtle, plausible, nevertheless gratuitous assumptions which vitiated all their learned exegetical processes. If the reader wishes to witness the muddle he can do so by a look into “Peter’s Theocratic Kingdom”, vol. II. pages 244-247.

Post-millenarians place this judgment at the end of the world and make it inclusive of the totality of the saved and the lost. Pre-millenarians place the first “some” at the beginning of the Millennium and the second “some” at the end of the Millennium, and regard the two as inclusive of all the saved and all the lost. But it is fatal to both hypotheses that Daniel speaks only of “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth.” This leaves a large proportion of the sleepers not accounted for; while Rev. 20:1-6, 11-15, include absolutely all the sleepers.

The two “somes” of Daniel 12:2 have nothing to do with Rev. 20:11-15 which is a post-millennial event, while Rev. 20:1-6 is pre-millennial and embraces the two classes mentioned in Dan. 12:2.

The Holy Spirit, foreseeing the exegetical subtleties of post-millenarian theologians, has taken special care to guard this truth in the most unmistakable manner by indicating two resurrections of the dead and placing the first before the Millennium and the other at its close. He separates the two by a period of one thousand years, and reiterates the fact no less than five times. Postmillenarians put the whole of Dan. 12:2 at the end of the thousand years, while Pre-millenarians put part at the beginning and part at the close. Both are wrong. The scene is entirely pre-millennial, and the subjects of the judgment are believers and believers only.

Dr. S. P. Tregelles, of blessed memory, labored hard to find something in the Hebrew words and construction which would enable him to place the first “some” and the second “some” one thousand years apart, but it would not work. Peters cites Prof. Bush as making the two “somes” equivalent to “these” and “those”, assuming “these” to include the totality of the “many” and reserving “those” for the rest of the dead–the wicked to be raised at the end of the thousand years. But it is transparently manifest that the

“many” includes the two “some”, the “these” and the “those”, and we should read simply “these” and “these”.

The ground and fallacy of all these bewildering expedients lies in the assumption that the saved can never appear before Christ in a judicial capacity. They say the believer’s sins were all judged on the Cross and that therefore he can never come into condemnation. But we have elsewhere proven the fallacy of this kind of exegesis. In fact the Protestant Churches ever since the Reformation stand before God as the deliberate founders and defenders of a gigantic system of ecclesiastically petrified Antinomianism. They have perniciously misconstrued and perverted the doctrine of free Grace. They were so anxious to get rid of the Roman Catholic doctrine of “works” that they went to the opposite extreme and reduced Christian freedom to lawless license; and, as only one of the many evil results, have thereby divorced theology from ethics and virtually informed the people that if they keep the first table of the Moral Law they can afford to be quite indifferent to the second, forgetting that this is of the very essence of Antinomianism and Pharisaism. Matt. 5:21-26; 18:21-35; 1 John 2:8-11; 4:20-21. We have already seen how Martin Luther erred on this point and history has not been slow to tabulate the concrete results. We may here briefly look at the teaching of the Confession of Faith along this line.

> ***“They whom God hath accepted in His Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved”. Confession of Faith, Chapter XVII.***

Note: **1.** Why insert that superfluous word “effectually”?

Paul and Peter never use it in this connection. The Divine call in the first degree is always effectual. See Chapter 6 of this book.

2. Are there not multitudes of Christians who are called and yet know nothing of sanctification by the Spirit? It goes without saying that all “who are sanctified by His Spirit” will persevere to the end. But what of carnal Christians? 1 Cor. 3:1-15; 2 Cor. 12:19-21.

3. Since most Christians live and die in a carnal state it must follow that it is possible to fall from grace and yet not be eternally lost. There must be a middle way.

In section II of the same chapter we read:

> ***“The perseverance of the saints depends, not on their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election.”***

What a pity that a rational human being could be found on the face of the earth who could believe such a dogma of unblushing fatalism face to face with the concrete facts of experience, observation and revelation. 1 Cor. 10:1-10, to say nothing of thousands of similar passages of Scripture, grinds such a dogma to powder and scatters it to the winds. Yes, and the framers of the Confession of Faith as a class know it now to their own unutterable sorrow.

In the Holy Light of God's Word, written and living, there is no escape from the conclusion that the majority of believers live and die in unbelief and sin. Rev. 2; 3.

The Reformed Churches have never yet construed and taught the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith according to the Spirit of Truth. I have never met a work on justification which will bear the light of Scripture. We will endeavor to amplify and explain this statement.

We must distinguish sharply between the believer's *standing* and his *state,* and the Scriptures which deal with each. Those portions of the Word which deal with the former tell us of what Christ in life and death did for His people, and thus provided the believer with an imperishable standing in the presence of God representatively in Christ. We may quote here as to standing the following as samples: Rom. 6:6a; I Cor. 1:30; Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:10. Note that the believer had no part in this great work of the Saviour, and had no power to resist, or hinder, or change it one iota, for it was all done before he had any actual existence: Yea, even the wicked Jews and the Romans and the very powers of hell could not, with all their deadly opposition and cruel malignity, prevent the outflow of God's great love in the awful tragedy of the Cross of Calvary.

He who sincerely accepts Christ as his Saviour from sin is in turn accepted of God, for Christ's sake, forgiven, regenerated, and justified. This gives him from the beginning a perfect standing in Christ regardless of his past life, and also regardless of the fact that sin is still strongly intrenched in his fallen nature. This is his justification as a sinner. And we may affirm, as a general principle, that it can never be lost, because "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance". Where God grants the free gift of eternal life in response to faith He never recalls it.

We may therefore place the believer's standing in Christ at 100, that is, perfect.

Now let an imaginary line be drawn under all that we have said in reference to the matter of "standing".

Below the line write, "The Believer's State". Theoretically and relatively we may place this at 10 as soon as the new birth becomes a fact, i.e., when the free gift of eternal (not age-lasting here) life is imparted. His responsibility is now wholly with his state, which he is under the most solemn

responsibility to improve to the utmost limit of his opportunity and God's grace. Growth in grace, which includes the symmetrical development of heart, mind and will, must advance his state from 10 to 20, to 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, and, if possible, to 100, in order that state and standing may ultimately harmonize, so that the mature believer may, in the day of judgment, stand before God and "be found of Him without spot and blameless." 2 Peter 3:14; Eph. 5:27; Song of Solomon 4:7.

This is the most tremendous task that any man ever faced, and the conflict increases as the process of sanctification advances into deeper, and still deeper deaths, in the fellowship of the Cross of the Christ. The Christian ideal is unrelenting and imperious in its holy and just demands: "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Matt. 5:48; 18:34; Heb. 2:1-3; 10:31. Truly and with deep emotion may we ask with Paul, "Who is sufficient for these things"? and God's response is, "My Grace is sufficient for thee; for My strength is made perfect in weakness. 2 Cor. 12:9. It is this fact, the full salvation of believers, that explains the deep solicitude and tremendous earnestness of the great "Apostle of the Gentiles." To Timothy he says, Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on Messianic-Millennial life. To the Thessalonians and with profound satisfaction he says, "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, beloved brethren in the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to (Messianic-Millennial) Salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (concerning the Messianic Kingdom)." 2 Thess. 2:13; 1 Pet. 1:1-2; 2 Pet. 1:4; Acts 20:32; 26:18; Heb. 10:19-21; 12:22-23. By way of contrast see 1 Cor. 3:1-15; 2 Cor. 12:19-21; Gal. 5:4; 6:6-8; Heb. 6:4-8.

Now nothing is more common in the history of religion than for fresh converts to go on with the Lord for a while and then go back to the world. Col. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:10; Gal. 3:1-3; Rev. 2; 3. Others never feel any real sense of obligation to try to go on. There are two classes of backsliders; those who repent and return, as Peter, David, John Mark; and those who do not return, do not repent, but go on in the "broad way" and die in unbelief and sin. The point is this: In neither case is the standing of the believer affected; but the state is, and consequently the Scriptures use the words "justify" and "justification" with references to the "state" of believers as distinct from their standing. Every believer must, as regards his state, be, at any given moment, either justified or condemned. If justified he is designated by the term "just" or "righteous". If in sin and under

condemnation he is “unjust”, “unrighteous “, “wicked”. Pro. 4:18; 2 Pet. 2:9. Acts 13:39 has special reference to the believer’s state. David said, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.” He, himself, was that man. After his great sin, through repentance and forgiveness, he stood before God justified. But the believer who dies in his sin, condemned, must go to the Hadean prison house and there, now and in the Millennial age, reap as he has sowed. Matt. 5:21-26; Gal. 6:7; Col. 3:25. But they are prisoners of hope. Zech. 9:12; Psalms 69:33; 79:11. Many a believer on reading these words will be moved to anger, and will say, “This is awful. What! a child of God, redeemed by the blood of Christ, possessing the free gift of eternal life, and having his name on the roll of such and such a Christian Church; is it possible that such an one can live and die a believer and with a true standing in Christ, and yet go where the Rich man went? Such teaching terrifies me. It can’t be scriptural.” It had been well with the Rich Man if the truth of God’s word had smitten him with terror a little sooner.

Well, is it not better to be terrified now than, like Dives, to postpone the crisis till the word of God passes from warning to actual realization. Read Matt. 18. again; Rev. 2:20-23.

Typical orthodox believers, like the framers of the Westminster Standards and their lineal descendants, have no hesitation in consigning all but a small percentage of the human race to a literally eternal hell, and yet will be horrified at the thought that they, dyed with sins of which many sinners have never been guilty, should find their abode in hell even for one thousand years. Will it-not do them good to take at least a taste of their own medicine? Matt. 7:1-5, 21-23; Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31.

I admit that this teaching forms a startling contrast to that of the orthodox clergy, especially on funeral occasions when deceased believers, between whom and the world there was no visible line of separation, are pictured to fancy as arrayed in white robes, crowned with golden crowns and standing in the presence of God and in every way sharing in the glory ineffable. No doubt the Rich Man of Luke 16:19-31 had just such a funeral.

We have spoken of the justification of the sinner above the line; and of the backslider below the line, the one having reference to “standing” and the other to “state”. But there is another great fact under the line which we have not noticed: Namely, the justification of the believer as the result of unflinching obedience to the voice of God when put to the test, and where there is no sin in question. The inspired writers say:

> ***“Abraham believed the Lord and He counted it to him for righteousness.”*** Gen. 15:1-6; Rom. 4:19-22.

Referring to this the Pulpit-Commentary cold-bloodedly affirms: “Abraham believed God and God forgave his sin.” How absurd, and trifling is such a

careless exegesis. Abraham had just returned from the slaughter of the kings who had captured Lot, his nephew, and was apparently afraid of reprisals by the heathen nations. Hence Jehovah, not Elohim, reveals Himself again and says, "***Fear not Abram, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward,*** " Gen. 15:1. Besides, doubts were seeking to enter his heart concerning the promised son and seed: "***And Abram said, Lord God,*** (note the compound name), ***what wilt thou give me seeing I go childless?***" The response is, "***This*** (Eliezer) ***shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And He brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them; and He said unto him, so shall thy seed be. And he believed Jehovah and He counted it*** (his faith) ***to him for righteousness.***" Gen. 15:1-6.

Where does the sin come in? It can only be found in the text after it is read in. And what did Abraham really believe? He believed God for the promised Son, for the gift of the land (Gen. 12:3; 13:15; 15:7); that God would raise him from the dead and put him in possession of the land and there and then make his seed numerous as the stars in heaven. In substance he believed God for the glorious Theocratic Messianic-Millennial Kingdom when as yet he was childless. Surely this is infinitely more than the negative blessing of sin forgiven, even if sin had been in question.

Abraham continued to believe and obey God, rising by degrees to a higher and higher level of justification as to his *state,* till the series of testings culminated in his offering of his son Isaac. And as he rose from 50, to 60, 70, 80, etc., God kept reckoning his faith to him for righteousness. After the offering of Isaac we read of no more testings. Abraham was here established on this high level as a permanently justified man as to his *state.*

To reckon a man righteous (as to his state) is the same as to justify him (as to his state). Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1-14. But do not overlook the vital fact that Abraham's faith had to find expression objectively through works. He did everything Jehovah Elohim told him to do. Gen. 22:11-18; 26:5. Contrast Deut. 11:27-28; 28:62; Judges 2:2; 6:10; 1 Sam. 15:19-22. And so the Holy Spirit by James says, "***But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified*** (as to his state and that finally) ***when he had offered up Isaac his son upon the altar?***" James 2:21-24.

Abraham was a saved man when he entered Canaan; but had he disbelieved God concerning the land, and the numerous seed, and had he held back Isaac from the sacrifice, and continued in that state, he would have died in unbelief and sin and would have no part in the first resurrection and the coming glory. God would have used some other man. Thus we draw the distinction with its correlative conclusion: In the justification of the sinner, works have absolutely no place as a ground of

commendation or in any way. There is repentance, abandonment of sin, but even these have no merit. It is naked faith in the finished work of Christ in life and in death. In other words, works have nothing to do with the believer's standing at conversion or at any subsequent time. But below the line, and in reference to the believer's state, it is quite otherwise. Justification here is still by faith, but it is faith expressed through works. Thus when the state is in question, good works as the medium for the expression of faith are necessary, absolutely necessary; without them faith is dead, just as the body without the soul is dead. Faith, subjectively, is the efficient cause, and works the instrumental cause of salvation from the power of sin and entrance into the Messianic Kingdom.

"***He that endureth to the end shall be saved***". And the secret of endurance is obedience to the voice of God as expressed in the word. Of course all this presupposes the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as the ultimately efficient cause of both faith and works.

Now observe a great truth:

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (with many other Old Testament Saints) lived in obedience to God's word and will; and they "died in faith not having received the promises", Heb. 11:13; but they will yet receive them; and so it is said of them that "they are now living and that God is their God; and because they are living (in real communion with God) they are ready for the first resurrection. Lev. 23:17; Phil. 3:9-10; Rev. 20:5-6. But on the contrary Christ said, of those who came out of Egypt under the blood of the Passover lamb, and who lived and died in disobedience and unbelief (the marks of their evil state), to the Jews: "***Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness and are dead*** (spiritually)." They are not now in real fellowship with God as are Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Therefore they are not in the same place, locally, or spiritually. Then Christ adds: ***This*** (Truth) ***is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die*** (spiritually); but "live for the (Millennial) age." John 6:48-51; 14:6. And these two classes of believers in the Old Testament, the living and the dead, have their perfect anti-type in the New Testament. Rom. 8:13-14; 2 Cor. 4:11; 2:15-16. We have the living of both ages in Rev. 20:6; Heb. 11:39-40; while in Rev. 20:5; Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31, we have dead believers. 1 Tim. 5:6. Of course in the first of the last three passages all the other dead are included. In Rom. 8:28-39 Paul is speaking only of living believers "***Them that love God.***" 8:28. To abide in unbroken communion with God is to live in this sense. Those who do not so abide are "**cut off**". John 15:6; Rom. 11:17-24; Lev. 17:10.

And let us not forget that the names of all Jews who came out of Egypt, actually under the blood of the Passover lamb, are still borne on the breast of the Great High Priest in Heaven; and in God's sight,, who sees the end

from the beginning; and "counteth the things that be not as though they were", the twelve stones shine with undimmed lustre and fascinating prophetic brilliancy. Ex. 28:15-21; Isa. 49:14-16; Rom. 11:11-24. So will it be with all who fail God as to their state in this Gentile Age. The ultimate Salvation of all believers is absolutely assured.

Before leaving the question of the believer's standing and state permit three remarks:

a. The adjective *just, righteous* (dekaios), is seldom, if ever, applied to a believer on account of his standing, though, of course, the cognate verb (dikaioo) is. God said to Noah "Thee (only) have I seen righteous (*tsaddiq,* the equivalent of *dikaios)* before me in this generation." Gen. 7:1. "The path of the righteous is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Pro. 4:18. See Deut. 25:1. Thus a righteous man is not merely one who is born again, but one who is living in the fear and favor of God. In the Seth line there may have been many believers in the true God, and really saved in the first degree, but there was only one believer in the true God who was really living in fellowship with God-righteous Noah. Let us suppose that in the City of Rochester there are 10,000 Christians, people who have the free gift of eternal life; and let us further suppose that the Lord God were to send the angels to gather out the *righteous* ones. We may wonder how many would they find. I would not like to hazard a guess. Abraham could not get ten in Sodom. But here is the point-all the unrighteous, saved and unsaved, perished in the floods of water and of fire. Moreover, Matt. 24:32-51 is spoken specifically for the warning and benefit of God's people. So was Mark 9:38-50. Not for sinners.

A believer's standing in Christ cannot save him from the judicial consequences of sin in the life, even though it be done in ignorance, unless before he dies he has made it right with God by repentance and confession. Luke 12:41-48. "Now is the day of Salvation"-for the believer as well as for the sinner; for in both cases, though in different senses, "the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23; Rev. 22:12. To affirm that it can be otherwise is not merely to contradict Scripture, but to sanction the worst kind of antinomianism and put a premium on licentiousness. But God is not mocked by either. Gal. 6:6-8.

b. It is common to speak of the "finished work of Calvary", but in doing so we should be careful to remember that this expression applies, we may say, exclusively to the Upper side of the line-Christ's Holy life and vicarious death for us. Every man on the earth may say, "that was and is for me."

Since the time of Count Zinzendorf (1727-1780) there have been groups of people here and there, with a predisposition to

fanaticism,}who have sought to claim Scriptural warrant for the application of this expression to the diagram below the line, and to the believer's state. This also leads to antinomianism and licentiousness. Abraham, when he offered Isaac, must have come as near to the goal as a saved and sanctified man can in this life. So Paul. Compare Phil. 3:7- 14, and 2 Tim. 4:6-8. Yet we must keep pressing continually toward the goal. Heb. 6:1-2; 12:14. Contrast. Heb. 5:14-16; 1 Cor. 3:1-15; Gal. 5:19-21. But so long as the believer carries the fallen Adamic nature, which shows its presence in physical decay, in mental fallibility, and many other ways, the work is not finished.

c. The third chapter of Romans states and illustrates God's provision for the Justification of the sinner; and then in chap. four Paul takes up the Justification of the believer. This is a distinction of incalculable importance. Chap. 3 gives redemption facts which belong above the line; and chapters 4 below. Rom. 6. points out the believer's riches, resources, in Christ because of the immovable security of his standing; while 7 presents the unsuccessful effort of the believer to enter upon his possessions in Christ and thus turn potential into actual wealth. The failure is accounted for thus: (a) He does not see his judicial freedom as provided in Chapter 6, either as to freedom from the Law on the negative side, or the provision in grace on the positive side; (b) he does not realize the depth of his natural depravity and therefore the uselessness of self effort; (c) nor does he see that the rich provision of grace presented in chapter VI is of no practical utility apart from the indwelling and efficient operation of the Holy Spirit. Chapter VIII presents the believer in possession of victory by faith through reliance on the Holy Spirit. "He shall take of mine and show it unto you."

The reader who has followed the line of thought so far will have no difficulty with the remainder of the chapter. And those who have not should read a second time before going any further.

The reference in Dan. 12:2 is confined to the Millennial period. We have the same division of believers here that we had in our discussion of the narrative of the Rich Young Ruler in our first chapter. Unless this young man repented, and returned, and accepted the Master's stern conditions, he will appear at the resurrection among those raised to age-lasting shame. But there will be degrees in this state.

In Luke 18:28-30 Christ makes it very plain that only those who forsake all to be wholly His will enter the Messianic Kingdom. This is confirmed in a thousand ways. Luke 14:25-33; 9:23; Matt. 7:13-14; Heb. 2:1-3; Luke 6:27-49.

In the introduction we laid down three fundamental conditions of security in the study of the Bible: **Correct *Translation***, **Correct *Interpretation***, and **Correct *Application***.

The traditional use of Dan. 12:2 violates all three. This is but one example out of thousands.

The word translated “shame” is *cherpah.* It is translated also, *reproach, rebuke, scorn, contempt;* and its use in such passages as Micah 6:16; Isa. 54:4; Josh. 5:9; Isa. 25:8; Jer. 31:19; Ezek. 36:30, shows that it is always used of temporal sorrow or loss. The word rendered *contempt* appears only in Dan. 12:2 and Isa. 66:24, and expresses in the former the thought of something reputed as not fit for acceptance; something rejected; and in this it agrees with Matt. 7:21; 25:12; 1 John 2:28; Heb. 12:14, in all of which the reference is to believers who are not ripe for glory, and who may be carnal, worldly.

And as to the idea of translating either the Greek *aiōnios,* or the Hebrew *olam* (when used in the construct state) by the English “everlasting” or “eternal” except when they refer to God and His attributes, and when the concept of eternity is already in the noun, is nothing short of a monumental disgrace to Christian scholarship. Of this I am absolutely sure, on historical, philological and exegetical grounds. It would be interesting to find the Christian scholar who has the courage to attempt a concrete denial of this impeachment.

We will now consider the case of the Rich Man in hell. Luke 16:19-31.

We all know from our childhood that this man is looked upon as irretrievably and eternally lost. The Lord only knows how many thousands and even millions of sermons have been preached on “eternal punishment” with this narrative as the text.

May I remind the reader once more that I am not trying to disprove, or combat that doctrine. My aim is to rightly divide the Scriptures. It must be admitted, however, that if we succeed in the accomplishment of our task, the traditional advocates of this doctrine will find themselves deprived of a huge amount of their munitions. For example, we cannot allow them any longer to translate the Hebrew *olam* and the Greek *aiōnios* into English by the words *eternal* or *everlasting,* or the Greek *eis ton aiōna* by for ever. Nor can we longer tolerate the application to sinners of passages of Scripture which manifestly belong to Christians, such as Heb. 6:2; 6:4-8; 10:27-31; Matt. 5:21-26. But in doing so we must not overlook the terrific force of such portions as: “***The smoke of their torment ascendeth up unto the ages of the ages***”. Rev. 14:11. So also Matt. 12:30-31. Note, however, that neither of these passages applies to the unsaved generally, but to certain sinners guilty of special forms of evil.

The light of truth has, in the last four hundred years, compelled Rome to give up much which she once thought necessary to her very existence. Protestantism has also many lessons to learn in this direction. There is nothing but loss to humanity and dishonor to God in the false interpretation and perversion of His infallible word. I want all I can get of it, not only in my mind, but especially in my heart and will. There is no other salvation.

What had this Rich Man done to merit the supposed doom of eternal, unending damnation? The fact is, so far as the narrative goes, that he had done nothing.

The ground of his condemnation is not that he did this or that; but rather for what he ought to have done and did not do. His sin is one of omission and not of commission. It is not affirmed that he had inflicted any positive injury on Lazarus, or anybody else. His sin was that of negative inhumanity. Then I ask, are 'there not thousands of Christians who are deeply guilty, not only of negative but of positive inhumanity. And God is no respecter of persons. Reader, just do a little thinking for yourself here.

Some Pointers:

1. It is a universal law of nature and of the Kingdom of God that sin and suffering are inseparable, and that God's laws are just and beneficent. The law holds in the present age and also in the age to come. And I do not deny, but rather affirm, that it will hold in the eternal state. So on the 'other side" are 'obedience' and blessing inseparable.

2. The present is, for believers, specifically the age of sowing, and that to come the age of reaping. Luke 18:28-30; Gal. 6:6-8. What believers know of sorrow or joy between the new birth and their decease, is only of anticipatory character, an earnest. Of course, we must distinguish between the sorrow of the world which works death, and that of the fellowship of the Cross which works life. 2 Cor. 4:11- 18.

3. It is no part of the intention of God in the atonement effected by Christ on Calvary to put a premium on sinfulness in the lives of His people, but rather the reverse. Rom. 6:1-3, 15-16; Heb. 10:26-31; Rev. I; II; III. But it is impossible to deny the openly apparent fact that the traditional interpretation does encourage sin and general lawlessness in the lives of believers.

4. The Scriptures teach that when a man repents and comes to Christ all his past sins are forgiven and put away as far as the east is from the west. Not so, however, with sins committed after conversion, rather, after regeneration. These may or may not be forgiven in this life, this age. If not the account must be squared in the age to come. Matt. 5:21-26; 18:21-34. This does not teach that God will never forgive the sin of

His child, but simply that he will pay the penalty God's holiness demands.

5. The Holy Spirit makes it very clear through Paul that the Jewish Church, if we may so designate it, and the Christian, stand related as type and antitype. There are some prominent marks in the analogy: Both began in a special manifestation of God. Compare Ex. 12—14 and Acts 1—3.

Both very quickly went into a state of apostasy. Judges 2; Acts 20:28-30; Rev. 2; 3. Both are finally rejected of God. Hosea 1:9; 7:13; Rev. 3:14-17; Rev. 2:1-7. In each case there is a spared remnant which remains faithful. Isa. 65:1-16; Heb. 11; Rom. 8:28-39; Rev. 3:4; Matt. 7:13-14; 24:25-27. In each case God holds the religious leaders of the people responsible for the apostasy. Ezek. 34; Isa. 3:12; Hosea 4:6; Acts 20:28-30; I Tim. 4:1-3; Rev. 2:1, 12, 18; 3:1,14. (Angel-pastor, preacher.)

And, finally, all the backsliders of both dispensations will in the coming age be ultimately restored. Surely this is the Gospel of a rational and divine optimism. Hosea 2:14-23; Matt. 5:21-26; Acts 3:21.

But let us, under this fifth head, particularize somewhat more generally so as to see the exact agreement of type and anti-type:

(1) In case of disobedience on the part of the people He had redeemed from Egyptian bondage, God threatened the most awful judgments conceivable. Lev. 26 and Deut. 28. Paul says, these things happened unto them for examples to us. 1 Cor. 10:1-10. "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." How often the master used that expression. The Jews were sure they could hear and see. Matt. 13:10-17.

(2) He told them that if they forsook Him He would forsake them and give them up to His four sore judgments, and He kept His word. Ezek. 14:21; Matt. 18:1-34.

(3) Jehovah declared in the most solemn manner that when the cup of their iniquity was full nothing would turn Him from His purpose to judge, and chastise, and afflict. The only deliverance then and now is righteousness of life, and holiness of character. Ezek. 14:12-14; Heb. 12:14. The language of Ezek 5-7 is awfully solemn, but it is the word of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Holy One of Israel. So is Matt. 18:1-34.

(4) He threatened them with expulsion from their land and He brought it to pass. Isa. 6:9-12; 2 Kings 17:13-23; 25:1-25; Deut. 31:16-21; Rev. 3:16. The suffering in these captivities must have been indescribably great. To this day they have no national home.

(5) The great sin of Israel was spiritual adultery. They claimed to be the chosen people of God and yet they loved the fellowship of the world. This leads inevitably to gross immorality. Ezek. 16:23-37;

Hos. 4:2, 13-14; Ex. 20:14. So it is in the Church. Jas. 4:4; Heb. 13:4; Rev. 2:22; Matt. 5:32. See what Israel and the Church ought to be, and ideally are, and some day actually will be. Ezek. 16:9-14; 2 Cor. 11:2. But notwithstanding the apostasy of the mass of believers in both ages God the Father through the Holy Spirit has been gathering out a Bride for His Son, a virgin, who in the Millennial age will be His constant companion. She will be very pure, very beautiful, and wonderfully glorious. Lev. 21:14; Psa. 45; Rev. 14:1-5; 19:5-9. Note the inner significance of Lev. 21:14. Contrast 2 Cor. 12:19-21. Those who would have a place in the Bride of Christ must enter personally into a special covenant. Listen to the Holy Spirit through Isaiah:

"***Incline your ear and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting*** (age-lasting) ***covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David***." Isa. 55:3. This has no reference to eternity. Before Christ descends into the air He will say to the angels, "***Gather my saints together unto Me; those that have made a covenant with Me by sacrifice.***" Psa. 50:5. See Rom. 12:1-2. The "***elect***" of Matt. 24:31 are the "***few***" of Matt. 7:14. All other believers belong to the "***many***" of verse 13.

(6) The failure of Israel to enter the Promised Land was to Paul a type of the prospective failure of the Christian Church of this age to enter the Messianic Kingdom. Num. 14; Hebrews 3; 4; Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Cor. 10:1-10; Jude 5; Matt. 7:13-14.

(7) He affirms that just as in Israel the natural branches were cut off because of unbelief and sin, so shall it be with the Church. Rom. 11:13-24; John 15:6. But it is not a final excision. It is to the Jews for this age and to many of them for the age to come also. To the Church, all but the few, the excision will be from the bliss and glory of the Messianic Age. But in due time God will "***graft them in again.***" Rom. 11:22-24; Acts 3:21. The Rich Man was one of the "***cut-off***" branches. Type and antitype agree everywhere. But do not overlook the fact that while Jewish and Christian branches are cut off, the trunk of the Olive Tree is not thereby affected. It is rooted deeply in the soil of God's wisdom, power and love as set forth in the Abrahamic Covenant and in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the "***Seed***" promised in that Covenant. He said "***I am the true Vine.***" John 15:1-1 0. He might have said with equal felicity, "I am the never-failing Olive Tree." Rom. 11:17.

(8) The Holy Spirit indicates that as the age of Grace is one of greater light than that of the Law, so the penalty for disobedience will be relatively that much greater. Heb. 2:1-3. This confirms our interpretation of 2 Thess. 1:7-10 given elsewhere.

We will now return to our main line of thought.

6. In His beautiful and solemn teaching on the vine and its branches the Master shows that one of two things must happen: The branch (the believer) must bear fruit or be cut off and cast into the fire. This figure would appeal vividly to the Eastern mind because it was a land of vineyards. But we must not carry the figure too far lest we lend support to the doctrine of annihilation. The standing of the believer, thus cut off, is not affected. Nor was that of the saved Jew who was cut off, for if so how could it be said that he would be grafted AGAIN into his own olive tree? The leprous, or unclean Israelite was put out of the Camp, but he did not thereby cease to be a member of that Camp. He simply lost for a time the enjoyment of the rights and privileges associated with that position.

Every believer must have his baptism of fire, to destroy the self-life and make room for the Christ-life, either in this age or in that to come. Thus John 15:6 agrees with Heb. 6:4-8; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Gal. 5:19-21; 6:6-8.

7. In Matt. 18:1-34 Christ speaks most solemnly of the responsibilities of discipleship, and of the moral accountability of His followers in the day of judgment. Why should preachers and commentators hand this chapter over to sinners? There had been a contention among the Apostles as to which of them would be the greatest in the coming Kingdom. At that time they did not understand the nature of the Kingdom. Nor did they see that the rejection of Messiah necessitated the postponement of it; nor yet that the death and resurrection of the Son of Man was the first step in that direction. It was not till after the resurrection of Christ and in the conversations of the forty days, and the experience at and after Pentecost that the dispensational purpose of God for this age was made perfectly clear to them. Acts 1:1-14; 2:1-36; 3:17-21.

To affirm, as postmillenarians do, that the Apostles, even after the ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, were deceived as to the nature of the Kingdom and the true character of this dispensation is silly nonsense, and betrays woeful ignorance of God's Plan of the Ages. Some say also that the Apostles expected the return of Christ in their own life time. This is contradicted by Acts 20:28-30; 2 Pet. 1:13-15; 2 Thess. 2:3; Matt. 25:19. (After a long time, now 1900 years). Besides, the prophetic succession of the Seven Churches had to run its appointed course. Sardis was only reached in post-reformation times, and we have only lately entered the Laodicean Period. And these Seven Messages are in line with Matt. 18:1-34. Are the Candlesticks of the big denominations still in their place and burning, and does the One like unto the "Son of Man" still walk in the midst? Surely not. Read again the quotation from Dean Stanley in the introduction.

8. Speaking of His coming to judgment at the close of this age, and with no reference whatever to the farther eschatological horizon at the close of the age to come, the Master says:

"***The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His Kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth in the Kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.***" Matt. 13:43, 49. The term righteous excludes all carnal, worldly Christians.

This word finds concrete embodiment in the Beatitudes. Matt. 5:1-12. Few Christians can stand this test.

It is fashionable to assume that "***them which do iniquity***" includes only sinners. But is it not a lamentable fact that Christians in general these days do iniquity with avidity? With what scheme for pleasure getting and money making are they not mixed up? Look at Matt. 13:41,49 in the light of 1 Cor. 3:1-15; Gal. 5:19-21; Matt. 13:34; 1 Cor. 10:1-10. The Rich Young Ruler came very near to the honor of being worthily designated *righteous;* but the Rich Man whose heart was unmoved by the pathetic appeal of Lazarus was far from it. But both of them had quite as good a claim as 90% of Christians today. "***If we would judge ourselves we would not be judged.***" 1 Cor. 11:31; Rev. 3:14-20. "***They shall gather out of His Kingdom*** (as it is in mystery during this age) ***all things that offend.***" And what could possibly be more offensive to Him who prayed so earnestly for the unity of His people in love than this huge Mustard Tree, this gigantic and universal system of Denominationalism with its historical jealousies, unseemly rivalries and corrupt theologies, professing to be His duly appointed representative in the earth? I can only think of one thing-a union of all these religious organizations on a basis from which every fundamental principle of Christian truth and righteousness has been eliminated.

9. The purpose of the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. V-VII, is to show the way into the Messianic Kingdom. Some preachers are inclined to look upon it as Utopian, as presenting an impossible standard for the individual, and an inaccessible ideal for society. They say, or assume, that its value lies in its ideality. But as a matter of fact there will be none in the Messianic Kingdom, on its celestial side at least, except those who have walked in this glorious pathway.

How beautiful are the Beatitudes of the Master: Blessed are the meek; Blessed are the pure in heart; Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness; Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

What does the average Christian of this Laodicean age know of this blessedness? Absolutely nothing. His whole life is ordered on the basis of the law of self-preservation and self-gratification, and this in the face of the Master's solemn warning as to the peril of such a course. Matt. 10:37-39; John 12:23-26.

When Christ uttered that startling warning in Matt. 7:13, no doubt He had specially in mind His own people. On the contrary, orthodoxy takes it for granted that believers cannot be found in the broad way to destruction. When the believer indulges the flesh and walks with the world, delighting in its ideals, and sharing its ambitions, he is in the broad way to destruction, so far as the Messianic Kingdom is concerned.

Paul is very emphatic and specific in his unqualified declaration that those believers who give themselves up to the works of the flesh shall not enter the Messianic Kingdom. Gal. 5:19-21; Rom. 1:18; 2:3-11; Phil. 3:17-19. We will touch this topic in Chapter 6.

10. John says, ***Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power.*** Rev. 20:6. Compare the word *blessed* with Matt. 5:1-12; and *holy* (hagios) with *righteous* (dikaois). See Heb. 12:14.

From this it is clear that none but those who have in some definite degree the qualities expressed in Matt. 5:1-12 will share in the first resurrection. The meaning of the "***second death***" is easily gathered from Mark 9:38-50; Heb. 10:26-31; 12:25-29; 2 Thess. 1:7-9; and when he says, "***But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.***" Rev. 20:5. What an inconceivable loss it will be to the Christian to be shut out from the Messianic Kingdom for a thousand years, and confined in the Hadean prison? Matt. 5:21-26. Surely the "***wages of sin is death***" for the carnal Christian as well as for the sinner. And why should it not be so?

What do these ten propositions establish? That if the Rich Man whose great sin was negatively inhumanity is lost eternally so are the vast majority of Christians who have lived during the present age, for their sins are of a far deeper dye. But they are not, therefore he is not; and the time of their restoration will be his time also. So shall it be with millions of others who in that dark age died in a similar state.

A Few Particulars From the Text.

(1) The Bible does not say this Rich Man is lost eternally. Then why read it into the text?

(2) This man's sin was one of omission, of negative inhumanity, and God is no respecter of persons. If this man has been consigned to a literally eternal hell what hope is there for most of us?

(3) He addresses his great ancestor as “Father Abraham”, and Abraham did not deny the relationship.

(4) Abraham addressed him as “Son”.

(5) The “Great Gulf” between is truly “Fixed”, but there will come a time when it will be bridged. Besides, if it is fixed eternally in his case it must be equally for the millions of Christians who according to the Master have gone where he is. Luke 9:38-50.

(6) Christ assures us that all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven in the age to come, except the sin against the Holy Ghost, for which there is no forgiveness. Matt. 12:31-32. Let both parts of the above propositions have all the force which the language of the Master will permit.

(7) The ground of the final deliverance, of all who ever shall be saved, is the atoning death and effectual intercession of Jesus Christ-the God-Man; and also, so far as it concerns believers who have died in disobedience and sin, the fact of their imperishable standing in Christ.

A few of the outstanding features of the apostasy of the Christian Church:

1. The very early abandonment of the Hope of the Apostolic Church in the Pre-millennial Coming of Christ, and the adoption of the Post-millenarian view.

Dr. Shedd says, “The period between the year 150 and 250 is the blooming age Millenarianism”. History of Doctrine. Vol. II. page 392. If he had read his Bible more inquisitively than he read Church History he would have discovered that the blooming age of Millenarianism was from A.D. 34 to A. D. 100; that is, Acts 1:1-11 to Rev. 22:20. I have yet to find a Church historian of the post-millenarian type who would not rather quote the Church fathers than the Prophets, Apostles and Christ; though it is openly admitted that the former were “notoriously unreliable.” I regret to have to say that the infidel Gibbon is far more reliable on this point than the typical writer of Church History.

2. The very rapid development of Nicolaitanism in its threefold progressive manifestation in Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, and Popery. Nicolaitanism is the enslavement of the people through the instrumentality of Church government and false doctrine. The woman who mixes the leaven (of error in doctrine and polity) in the meal of God’s truth is the same in every case. The only difference is that of degree. Matt. 13:33.

3. The adulterous union of the Christian Church with the Pagan Roman Empire at the beginning of the fourth century. The address to the angel of the Church in Pergamos has its prophetic application here. Rev. 2:12-16; James 4:4; 2 Cor. 6:14-18.

4. The Roman Catholic perversion of the Bible Doctrine of works. The address to the Church in Thyatira forecasts this. Rev. 2:18-24.

5. The Protestant perversion of the Bible Doctrine of Grace. The Sardian letter applies here. Rev. 3:1-4. Of the last two each is the complement of the other. The deception is one while the manifestation is two-fold.

There are, as I have pointed out elsewhere, two great motives to holy living. They are the love of God and the fear of God. These include the love of truth and righteousness and holiness; and also the hatred of sin in all its abstract and concrete forms. The Father says with delight to the Son during His life on earth, "***Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil*** (the Holy Spirit) ***of joy above Thy fellows***". Heb. 1:9. What is it that keeps thousands of people from stealing other people's property? Nothing but a sober fear of the civil law. God intended it should be so, not only in civil but also in divine government. The atonement was not intended to abolish the law of cause and effect but rather to emphasize and glorify it.

"***The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom***". Prov. 1:7.

"***He was heard in that He feared.***" Heb. 5:7.

Through an antinomian perversion of God's truth the churches have turned the doctrine of free grace into a Divine approval of sin; and Christian liberty into a licence to practice iniquity with impunity.

CHAPTER 5:
HUMAN DESTINY OR THE SHEEP AND THE GOATS.

"Idolatry of intellect. The part of man which is especially worshipped is that by which he was at first led astray, seeking to be as God, and going in quest of the knowledge of good and evil. Other things are depreciated; the want of intellect brings contempt; the supposed possession of it elevates, even in the absence of moral qualities. Cleverness, genius, ready wit, originality, and such like these are the things that men admire, nay, worship.

Hence man's wisdom rises in esteem, and the simplicities of Christ are disparaged. The Bible is only admired in so far as it is an exhibition of intellectual power, or as the means of enabling man to display his intellect. That age is evil when, by the worship of human talent, man is exalted; and that part of his being, which has always been most hostile to God, made the object of all but divine adoration."—Journal of Prophecy.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall

be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?* Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal. " Matt. 25:31-46.

We will come to the heart of our subject with as little delay as possible. The problem of Human Destiny surpasses in importance all others with which the mind of man may be occupied. The worth of all knowledge, and all human "goods" of every conceivable kind culminates in victory or defeat at that moment when the spirit of man closes its eyes on this earthly scene and opens them face to face with the stern verities of the other world. And that, there is another no sane man will deny. Neither will any sane man deny that the relation of the present to the future is that of cause and effect.

THE ORDER OF EVENTS.

The signs of the times, viewed in the light of prophecy, indicate with infallible certainty that we are very near the end of the present age, or dispensation, the most tremendous crisis in the history of the world. Note the following:

1. Sixty-nine of Daniel's Seventy Weeks (of years) closed with the crucifixion of the Christ. Dan. 9:24-27; Ex. 12:1-20; Matt. 26:1-66.

2. The Seventieth Week will begin with the appearance of the Antichrist in Jerusalem; and, presenting himself to the Jews as their long promised

Messiah, they will accept him and enter into a covenant with him. Dan. 9:27; John 5:43. The present age falls between these two points.

3. At the middle of the Week (three and one-half years) he will break the covenant and become their persecutor. Dan. 9:27.

4. By this time the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman Earth, and the revived Roman Empire, will have been established with the Antichrist as supreme head.

5. At the end of the second half of the Seventieth Week, Gentile World-Dominion will come to an end in Universal Catastrophe. The Holy Spirit tells us of this in Rev. 19:11-21; Dan. 2:43-45. The present World War is simply the prelude to the opening of the Seventieth Week, and, especially, to the Great Tribulation which begins at the middle of the Week. Dan. 9:27; 12:1,2; Matt. 24:21.

6. Just before the last blow, which utterly paralyses and annihilates all Gentile World-Power, the Second Advent of Christ takes place.

7. Concurrently with this is the resurrection of the righteous of all dispensations, and the judgment of the saved. 2 Cor. 5:10. The first two parables of Matt. 25 come in here. This carries us over into the next age, or dispensation.

8. The first steps are taken towards the establishment of the Theocratic-Millennial Kingdom. Rev. 20:1-4. The two parables of the virgins (Matt. 25:1-13; and that of the Talents, 14-30) disposes of believers. Following this we have the judgment of The Living Nations (Matt. 25:31-46).

Thus two important facts are established: First, This is not in any sense a judgment of Believers; Second, This judgment scene is not at the end of the world (the millennium), but at the end of the present age. Thus we have settled the Time of the judgment, and the Subjects of it. But most important of all, we must now decide The Nature of the judgment.

I will here anticipate my finding prior to the demonstration of the fact. The conclusion reached through the line of study here pursued along the highway of analysis and synthesis to the goal of a logical deduction was not the avenue through which the truth was first reached. It was not reached by a logical process at all. It was a discovery resulting immediately from intuition and by way of inference. And it is this:

Matt. 25:46 has absolutely nothing to say of the eternal state of either the saved or the unsaved; and has direct reference only to the age to come, the thousand years intervening between the second coming of Christ and the Judgment of the Great White Throne. Rev. 20:11-15.

Just very shortly after the true interpretation of Luke 18:28-30 was flashed into my mind, Matt. 25:46 came before me, and the inevitable inference was irresistible. But no honest student will let matters rest there. Truth reached by revelation or intuition must submit to be thrown into the

crucible of a logical process. The logical faculty has a right, within certain limits, to challenge the intuitive faculty, and demand of it the reason why. This being so, at the first opportunity I went to work on the passage (Matt. 25:31-46), examining every verse and every important word in the original, with the result that I found not one single iota of fact to cause me to doubt the correctness of my inference. The reader has a right to be conducted through every step of the process and to have permission to challenge it at any point where he has reason to suspect any unintentional oversight, or wilful concealment of facts.

But before entering on our study let me insert a remark or two growing out of the very nature of the case:

Once grant that in between the present age and eternity there is another age which has its own distinctive eschatology with its accompanying outlook on the future, that is, on eternity, is it probable, is it logical, to suppose that the eschatological outlook of the present age would extend its horizon beyond the age to come and into the eternal state? I submit that it is not only very improbable, but dispensationally impossible. It would make an awkward break in the God ordained progression of the ages. But I do not have to insist on this. The exegetical wealth of the text makes external support unnecessary. At the same time it will be evident to the reader that only a portion of the facts can be produced within the space at our disposal.

SOME FACTS LYING MOSTLY ON THE SURFACE.

1. There are no Christians here; that is, none of the saved of this dispensation, nor of any former dispensation.

2. There is no question of resurrection, or judgment of the dead.

3. There is no question of having been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, nor of the blood of Christ, nor of the Holy Spirit.

4. There is no question of their being changed in the twinkling of an eye.

5. It is explicitly affirmed that they are Gentiles, living nations.

6. They are in mortal bodies, and, as we shall see later, the sheep continue in mortal bodies after entering the Kingdom.

7. They are divided according to moral character and not faith, into two classes, sheep and goats.

8. Their relation to Christ is that of subjects to a King. He is never spoken of as King in relation to the Church. He is the Head of the Body, the Church.

9. There are no terms of endearment as in John 13:33 (little children).

10. No possessive pronouns as “My”, “Your”.

11. The sheep here are therefore not those of John 10:1-19.

12. Neither the sheep nor the goats have ever before known Christ.

13. In every feature the judgment is distinct from that of Rev. 20:11-15, as to time, as to subjects, and as to results.

14. The goat was not so valuable as the sheep, but it was by no means a worthless animal. It was much used in the sacrifices to Jehovah.

15. In the age to come, the millennium, there will be nations, even Gentile nations, on the earth. Not so in the eternal state.

16. In the millennium there will be sin and death. Isa. 65:20. Not so in the eternal state. Rev. 21:1-7.

17. There is forgiveness of sin in the age to come for sins committed in this age. Matt. 12:31-32. I do not say that this is so in all cases.

18. Probation does not always end at the end of the present age. It does at the end of the age to come.

19. The age to come is distinctly said to be an age of restitution. Acts 3:21. Not so the eternal state.

20. All the heathen who have never heard the Gospel will hear it in the age to come, if not sooner.

21. The punishment into which the goats go is not eternal, but age-enduring, age-lasting, lasting during the age to come; and in that time they will have an opportunity to repent and be saved.

22. The eternal life into which the sheep go is the Messianic Kingdom, and the earthly sphere of that Kingdom. And in that sphere there will be many, very many unsaved people. This is clear from many passages. Otherwise, when the Devil is let out of his prison at the end of the Millennium for a little season he would not be able to deceive the multitudes of Gog and Magog. Rev. 20:7-9. These multitudes will have been in the Messianic Kingdom though not of it. So the sheep of our narrative will have to be saved by a living faith in Christ. There is no guarantee that they all will do so. If not they will be lost.

When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the Throne of His glory. ver. 31. It is not as God, essentially, but as the Son of Man that He is acting in the capacity of judge. The Redeemer must also be the judge. Grace offered must precede judgment as to final results. But results here are not final. See John 5:27. This is the same coming as that mentioned in Matt. 24:29-31. And as there is no room for a millennium before the great tribulation mentioned there, the coming must be premillennial.

The Throne of His glory here is the same as that in Rev. 3:21. The overcoming saints of all past dispensations will be seated there with Him and this will be no small part of His glory.

"And before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and He shall set the sheep on His right hand and the goats on His left. Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father (not your Father), inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Ver. 32-34.

This is the Messianic Kingdom promised to the Fathers, especially to David. 2 Sam. 7. The Son of David and the Son of Abraham will then rule in irresistible power and marvelous glory. Psalm 45 and 72. As already remarked this Kingdom will have two spheres, the earthly and the heavenly. In the latter everything will be in the full power of resurrection life and glory. Not so on the earth. These sheep unlike those in John 10 inherit the Kingdom, but on the earthly side, or sphere, and all such will be in mortal bodies. Here positions of vantage once held may be lost the same as in the present dispensation.

The "King" of verse 34 is the Lord Jesus Christ. He is now King *de facto,* whereas he has been King *de jure* for eighteen years. If the reader will examine Dan. 7:9-14 he will see that just before the judgment of the sheep and goats Christ has been crowned King in the heavens and has now entered on his work of conquest. The crowned King requires an actual kingdom with territory and subjects. The whole of Matt. 25 presents the King clearing the way for the full manifestation of the grace of God in the earth in order to bring such scenes as Psa. 72 to an actual realization.

The manner in which the sheep of verse 34 inherit the kingdom is quite different from the manner in which the saints of this and past ages inherit. The latter come into the possession of the kingdom through fidelity and righteousness, in other words, by conquest. Matt. 5:1-12; Rev. 3:21; Jas. 1:12. These all belong to the sphere of the heavenly kingdom. But when Christ sets up the earthly sphere with Israel as head of the Gentile nations, all the Gentiles who survive the great tribulation will find themselves in the Kingdom of the Son of David, because the Gentile world-power has come to an end. There is no other place for them to be. And Christ can say to every one of them, even to the unsaved "come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Their blessedness consists in their external privileges, not in the state of their hearts. This may or may not come later. Nevertheless the rule of Satan has gone and that of Christ has come.

In verses 35 and 36 Christ gives the reasons why the sheep have been spared and permitted to enter the Messianic Kingdom. He says," for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was imprisoned and ye came unto me."

The reader will note that there is not a word here about faith, or atonement, or cleansing through the blood, nor quickening by the Holy Spirit, not overcoming. The response of the sheep in verse 37-39 indicates clearly that they had no previous personal acquaintances with Christ. In verse 40 we have His reply to their fivefold question. It is this: "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto Me." The word brethren may have a double significance: (1) as applied to the Jews, the saved remnant of Zech. 13:9; and (2) as applied to saints who have just been previously removed from the earth and who are now associated with Christ in the judgment. Rev. 3:21. The expression "My Brethren" implies that they, the sheep, are not His brethren. Let it not be forgotten that all who are in the earthly sphere of the kingdom are in mortal bodies. When we speak as above some one will reply that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. 15:50. But in this passage Paul is dealing exclusively with the resurrection of believers and therefore with the heavenly sphere, and it is quite true that flesh and blood cannot inherit that. Paul says nothing here about the earthly side of the kingdom in the Messianic age; whereas in Matt. 25 Christ in speaking to the sheep refers exclusively to the earthly side; and here flesh and blood can and will inherit the kingdom. If this were not so there could be no sickness nor death during the Millennium. When the children of Israel entered Canaan they were under the theocratic rule of the heavens; and they were all in mortal bodies. Christ could have said to them what He says to the sheep here. And as the children of Israel did not prove themselves worthy of the inheritance they did not retain it. So will it be with thousands of the spared nations who are privileged to enter the theocratic kingdom when Jesus comes. If these sheep wish to retain the inheritance they must prove themselves worthy, otherwise they may become goats.

The "ready" of Matt. 25:10, and the "prepared" of Matt. 25:34, are the same in the original, only that the one is adjectival and the other verbal. Compare Matt. 22:1-14. The wedding was ready, but those invited were not worthy.

We must now examine the word righteous in verse 37. Quite evidently these are not the righteous (dikaioi) of Matt. 13:43,49. This word, except when applied to God, is a relative term. Different persons may be righteous in different degrees, just as others may be wicked in different degrees. Even of unsaved men certain acts may be said to be righteous, that is, according to the laws of nature, while others may be designated wicked. See Acts. 10:30-35, and Rom. 1:18-20; 2:12-15. Peter speaks of Lot as "that righteous man." Relative to the Sodomites he was truly such, but relative to Abraham he was unrighteous. So the sheep of our narrative relative to the moral character of the goats are called righteous; but relative to the

overcoming saints they are unrighteous. The unscholarly use of *dikaios* and its cognates by theologians and Bible students generally has opened the way for much confusion and evil. But we cannot enlarge on this now. It is worthy of note, however, that the term *wicked* (poneros) is sometimes applied to saved persons. comp. 1 Cor. 5:1-13; 2 Cor. 7:6-12 and Matt. 25:26. We find both words applied to believers in Matt. 13:49. The wicked here are made up of two classes-saved people who live in the flesh, carnal christians; and mere professors, the unsaved. The wicked saved are lost but not eternally. So in John 12:24, 25. They have missed the Messianic Kingdom, and in this sense have lost their souls and are cast into the outer darkness. This is a fearful thought, but it is the word of the living God. Matt. 10:37-39; Heb. 10:38-39.

The sheep are designated righteous on the simple ground that they have been kind to the King's brethren, even though they did not know Him. When we think of the suffering of the Jews in Europe today, of their awful persecution by the Russians, and then on the other hand reflect that here and there are unsaved nurses and benefactors ministering, to their needs without any thought of their nationality, or of the fact that they are God's chosen people, we have a living, present-day illustration of the truth of our narrative. There are some people who think that God takes no note of kindly acts done by the unsaved, but this is a fearful mistake and contrary to the word as we have seen in Rom. 1; 2; and Acts 10; Josh. 6:22-25.

"***Then shall He say unto them on His left hand, Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels***". Those addressed are the goats. Let us examine this word more carefully. The main key to a true exegesis must be sought in the exact meaning of the terms which the Holy Spirit employs. It is the same when men converse, or correspond, or do business. Not to use words of clearly defined meaning is inexcusable in an educated man. To deliberately choose ambiguous terms is to play the mean part of a Jesuitical sophist. The Holy Spirit is exceedingly careful and discriminating in His use of words. See, for example, the two words for love and the two for feed in John 21:15-17.

In the New Testament there are two words for goat. They are tragos and eriphion, the latter sometimes taking the masculine form, eriphos. Tragos means a full grown goat. In the O.T. the he-goat sometimes is the symbol, or type, of a wicked man, a leader in wickedness. It is thus used in Ezek. 34:17, and the Sept. translates it by tragos. Compare Isa. 3:12; and notice that in the addresses to the Seven Churches in Asia the message is to the pastors, not to the people, except indirectly. The New Testament has much to say against false teachers.

Now in the judgment we are considering the word tragos does not once appear. It is one of the two forms eriphos, or eriphion, which means a little

goat. Compare pais a boy, and paidion a little boy. Matt. 21:15; and Mark 10:13.

We thus properly conclude that the goats of our narrative are little sinners. The great sinners, he goats, have been removed before this judgment takes place. Rev. 19:11-21.

"Depart from Me ye cursed".

Moses pronounced fearful curses on the children of Israel if they did not obey God's word. Deut. 28. And these curses came upon them notwithstanding that they were by redemption the children of Jehovah. The City was cursed, Jer. 26:6; the land was cursed, Jer. 44:22; and the people were cursed, Jer. 44:8; Zech. 8:13. Even after the captivity the people came under the curse again. Mal. 1:14; 3:9. It is quite true that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law; and has thereby given us a standing before God that is perfect; but this will not prevent a carnal believer coming under the curse at the Bema Judgment. Matt. 7:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Tim. 1:20. I know this is a startling statement, but it is Scriptural; and this is my main concern. Every Higher Critic who has the gift of eternal life and who has passed over the lines knows today to his unutterable sorrow that a curse awaits him in the clay of the Lord. But this is only one form of sin. The reader may recall what we have already said on Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31. Read especially and with emphasis on every word, Heb. 2:1-3. But the curse will not rest on the Jew forever (I use the word in the English sense here); nor will it rest on the carnal Christian forever. And 1 affirm positively that there is no necessary reason why it should rest on these goats forever. We will meet this point lower down. But let us keep in mind that there are sins which can and sins which cannot be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. Matt. 12:31-32. We are on rock bottom here both positively and negatively. The everlasting fire of verse 41, and the everlasting punishment of verse 46 are identical, and therefore we will examine the former when we come to the latter. "Prepared for the Devil and his angels."

This word ***prepared*** appears here for the third time in our narrative. ver. 10, 34, 41. In ver. 10 it is translated ***ready***. Note the contrast: "The Kingdom ***prepared*** for you"; and "**fire prepared for the Devil and his angels**". This is not without eschatological significance. The sin and the sins of the Devil and his angels are all widely different from those of the fallen sons of Adam. God said to Abraham:

"***I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.***" Gen. 12:3. Matt. 25:41 is a particular application of God's solemn declaration to His faithful servant. But let us observe that this sin is covered by the atonement. I have already remarked that personal sins can be dealt with in two ways: By pleading the blood of Christ, confessing the

sin and abandoning it. Second, by enduring the penalty. Peter's denial of his Lord, and the falsehood of Ananias and Sapphira are illustrations to point. Here, in these cases, we have only believers. There is also a difference in the sins of the unsaved. The sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost hath no forgiveness. The man who refuses to accept the vicarious atonement of Christ as God's only way of salvation for sinners cannot be forgiven. We may set it down as an axiom of Biblical Theology and especially of Biblical Eschatology, that the one ground of eternal perdition is personal wilful rejection of the one atonement which Jesus Christ has effected in His life and in His death as bearing the sin of the world; and thereby satisfying the most absolute requirements of the Divine Holiness. Of course the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and the taking of the mark of the Beast, and such like, are wilful rejections of Christ and His atoning death. We are perfectly justified, then, in concluding that there is nothing *per se* in the sin of the goats to finally exclude them from a share in the benefits of the great redemption, any more than there was in the case of the Rich Man which is the case of the vast majority of Christians.

Since the beginning of the fourth century the Church has erred in the interpretation of our narrative in three respects: In respect to the sheep, the goats, and the Devil, and especially in reference to the last. How comes it that the New Testament has so much more to say on this subject than the Old Testament? The fuller revelation of God in Christ and of His Plan of the Ages necessitates a correspondingly full revelation of the Devil in his antagonistic relation to that Plan, and of the stages of the concurrent outworking of the two great mysteries of Godliness and of Iniquity. The one cannot be studied apart from the other without disturbing the equilibrium of truth. But as a matter of historical fact and current personal observation it is only too apparent that the Church has for hundreds of years abandoned the teaching of Scriptures on both sides of the mystery to her own undoing. Which side did she abandon first? This would be difficult to determine. It is very probable that the two evils grew up side by side. It is certain, however, that by the middle of the second century the great truth of the pre-millennial coming of Christ was rapidly losing ground; and the post-millennial view of prophecy was proportionately gaining. Thus in proportion as Christ was theoretically taken out of His Scriptural place as the rejected One of earth, and proclaimed as King of the Church and Ruler of the world; the Devil was displaced, theoretically, doctrinally, from his Scriptural place as the enemy of the Church, of truth and righteousness, and the actual ruler of the world within divinely prescribed limits. The damage of this double displacement to theology as a science, and to the Church as the body of Christ, has been incalculable as well as irreparable. The Church cannot, dare not, give to the Devil the attributes, functions, and prerogatives which the Scriptures assign him without thereby

necessitating an internal revolution in her theology, ethics, organizations and polity. The reason is that a misplaced Devil is the adversative complement of a displaced Christ. It is impossible to give the Son of Man His imperial rights in the Church till the Devil is first by faith dethroned. All error in doctrine, or polity, or depletion in spirituality, implies the relative exaltation of Satan in the professed temple of the living God. The result has been the almost complete obliteration of the line which in Scripture divides the world from the Church. This is most manifest in those countries where there is a State Church. And according to James 4:4 and other passages a State Church in this age must of necessity be a Harlot Church. The logical goal is Rev. 17.

THE GROUND OF CONDEMNATION.

"I was an hungered and ye gave Me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave Me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took Me not in; naked and ye clothed Me not; sick and in prison and ye visited Me not".

Will the reader notice thoughtfully that these are all negative sins, sins of omission. And as already stated in the case of the Rich Man such sins cannot provide a sufficient basis for the awful sentence of irreparable damnation. If they could there would be no escape for the vast majority of Christians from the same doom, unless we are prepared to affirm that one of the purposes of the atonement is to put a premium on sin for the convenience of carnal Christians. Millions of Christians have been guilty of these and worse sins against the Lord's brethren, the Jews.

The reply of those symbolized by the goats is that they were not aware of having been guilty of such sins as the judge specifies. This indicates that they had no personal knowledge of Christ either as a Saviour from sin, or in any other capacity, or respect. And are there not literally thousands of people even in the most civilized nations, to say nothing of heathen nations so-called, who are in this very condition of ignorance, darkness and apathy.

In the 45th verse Christ, the King, indicates the very close relationship between Himself and His brethren; and at this time especially His Jewish brethren. On the 10th of Nisan A. D. 34, God gave them up in a special manner to judicial blindness because they rejected His Son, their King. John 19:15. Four days later they crucified Him. Thus was the type of the Passover lamb fulfilled. "And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it (Him) in the evening. Ex. 12:1-14. That was the evening of a very long, and very dark night to the Jews. But after almost two thousand years we are very, very near the historical realization of the judgment scene which we are now studying. Just shortly before this solemn event, the Christ, the Messiah, the King of Israel, shall have appeared in glory on the Mount of Olives to the saved Remnant of Jews, those who shall have

survived the great tribulation, and there they will recognize Him as did Saul that memorable day on the way to Damascus. That will be a day of bitter wailing:

> ***"And I will pour upon the House of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of Grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon Me Whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for His only Son, and they shall be bitterness for Him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." Zech. 12:10.***

But this is not all. If it were the sorrow would be unbearable:

> ***"In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the House of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." Zech. 13:1.***

Thus the curse has been removed, the judicial blindness has been lifted and they are once more His *brethren* both by redemption and appropriation, as well as by kinship. These, forgiven and restored, stand by the side of the King while He judges the remnant of the nations. Zech. 14:1-21. Any kindness or evil done to them, even when in the state of judicial blindness, is regarded by the King as done to Himself. And He, the King, is not here speaking of what Christians have done or have not done to the Jews. That will be settled at the Bema Judgment. 2 Cor. 5:10. Many, indeed, of them also shall receive a sentence very similar to that passed on the goats. He is here speaking only of the nations; or rather, those portions of them which have survived the time of trouble such as never was before and never will be again. Matt. 24:21-31.

> ***"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."***

This brings us to the crucial point of the narrative, the *pons asinorum*[8] of ecclesiastical eschatology. Actual Biblical Eschatology has no real difficulty here, except to get the former out of the way, and by so doing clarify the spiritual horizon. So far as man had a part in the objective revelation of truth there is no danger in the human factor, for there man is in his proper place, the willing, efficient, humble instrument of the Holy Spirit. Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, John, James, Peter and Paul, are more or less transparent media; the heavenly light flows through them freely and beneficently. This is pre-eminently true of the human side of the Christ. In Him was life and the life was the light of men.

---

[8] **pons asinorum** /ˌasɪˈnɔːrəm/ ▶ noun the point at which many learners fail, especially a theory or formula that is difficult to grasp.**– origin** mid 18th cent.: Latin, literally 'bridge of asses', term taken from the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid.[Oxford Dictionary of English © Oxford University Press 2010]

But when we come to the subjective apprehension of that revelation the danger looms large to those who have the vision of God in reality. Here man is no longer the medium of communication subject to the Spirit of God; but viewed historically, the prolific producer and elaborator of ideas, theories, systems and institutions which even in outward form have little or no resemblance to Christianity. Paul as a medium on the objective side of revealed truth is all right. But John Calvin, or James Arminius, or Martin Luther, as media on the subjective side, the Church side, is another matter entirely. Here, not yonder, is the peril of the seeking soul. And to that very large number of religious people to whom the Church, their Church, is not only synonymous with Christianity, but is Christianity, the peril becomes a soul tragedy and the tragedy develops into a catastrophe.

But the danger is inevitable. Owing to the nature of man and also to the nature of the problem and the plan of redemption, the human instrument and medium is as indispensable on the subjective side as on the objective. The law of interdependence holds everywhere. And in the mechanism of the divine plan it is inevitable that some must lead and others must follow. From this standpoint the organic interdependence of the individual units which make up the ecclesiastical organism differ nothing from those of the political organism. The difficulty is not to get the masses to follow, but to find men who are competent to lead and worthy to be followed. God is not looking for good followers so much as for good leaders. The dearth of these has been the standing-disgrace of the Church. Human nature is prone to observe that great law of mechanics whereby every force is said to seek the line of least resistance. The fallacy lies in the assumption that we can reason from mechanism to organism, from physical force to moral force, and from a thing to a personality. All things considered the line of least resistance for the Christ lay through Gethsemane and Calvary. And what is true of the Christ is true of every human being born into this fallen world. Peter at the trial of his Master made a daring attempt to evade this fundamental law of the Kingdom, and we know with what remorse and sorrow to his soul. There is no denying the fact that all down this dispensation Christians generally have been seeking to do what Peter could not do, and what Paul would not do; and shall we dare to assume that they have succeeded, or are today succeeding? Those who think so will be effectually cured of the illusion in that day when they stand before the Bema of Christ to be judged for the deeds done in the body. 2 Cor. 5:10; Col. 3:25; Heb. 10:26-31.

We must now face the problem presented in Matt. 25:46.

So far in our progress through the successive chapters of this work our most efficient instrument has been the scientific principle of accurate definition. The reader will do well to recall and reflect anew on the quotation from Bacon in this connection. And in doing so it is impossible to

avoid conflict with the reasoning and conclusions of men who are famous for learning and whose opinions have, in orthodox circles, all the weight of inspired oracles. But the honest and devoted seeker after truth will take nothing for granted, nor will he recognize any absolute standard of truth except the word of God; and that only as properly translated, interpreted and applied.

I take it for granted that most candid readers feel obliged to confess that the generally accepted definition of the Greek adjective *aiōnios* is contradicted by the facts of etymology, history and consistent exegesis. When we know, for example, the length of a given age (as in Luke 18:30), and find the term *aiōnios* applied to that age, and then translated into English by such words as “eternal”, or “everlasting”, a very ordinary logical faculty ought to scent the suspicious odor of logical inconsistency and traditional bias. I have already pointed out that if the proper translation involved no other difficulty than an appeal to the simple fact of etymology, a school boy might settle the question for all time. The supporters of certain theological theories and dogmas ought to know that if they define such words as *Aion, aiōnios,* and *olam,* in accordance with their plain etymological signification, they will be obliged to abandon some of their dogmas, and consent to the need and demand for revision of traditional theology in general, and of eschatology in particular. Once admit that between the close of the present age and the judgment of the Great White Throne there is another age during which Israel is restored to the place of corporate testimony in the earth, and you cut the ground completely from under the post-millenarian. This he cannot tolerate. A false interpretation is preferable to the humiliation of having to admit and confess that the teaching of this or that Church has been untrue and misleading. But when they discover, as in the majority of cases they certainly will, that their devotion to the traditions of men has cost them the loss of the Messianic Kingdom and involved them in age-lasting destruction, their sorrow will be exceedingly great. May the study of this book save many from so terrible a calamity. This is one of its purposes.

Before proceeding to a more critical examination of the passage before us, I would ask the reader to consider his standpoint, and especially to consider with keen discrimination what is the true eschatological horizon before us as determined by Matt. 13, 24-25. Nothing could be more self-evident than the fact that we are here dealing with the nearer eschatological horizon. Very, very rarely does the perspective of the Master rest upon and bring into relief the solemn facts of the final judgment at the end of the Millennium. And what is true of the four Gospels is also true of the New Testament as a whole and, indeed, of the entire Bible. Discrimination between the nearer and farther horizon is fundamental not only to Biblical Eschatology, but to the whole range of Biblical Theology.

Not only do the majority of writers and preachers fail to make this distinction; but, as already remarked, they are under the grip of an imperious necessity to deny that any such distinction exists. With the above reminder before us we will proceed:

There are in Matt. 25:46 three words the proper definition of which must contribute very largely to a true interpretation of the passage. They are *zoe* (life), *aiōnios* (everlasting, eternal), and *kolasis* (punishment); and the compound formed by the first two. We have already demonstrated that the phrase "eternal life" has two meanings in Scripture-the free gift and the prize. The Rich Ruler was after the latter-the Messianic Kingdom. We cannot, however, examine the term *kolasis* without some further discussion of the term *aiōnios.* Kolasis has as its synonym the term *timoria* (long o).

The former occurs twice in the N. T. as a noun (Matt. 25:46, and I John 4:18); and twice in verbal form (Acts 4:21, and 2 Pet. 2:9). The latter is found only three times. In Heb. 10:29 as noun; and in Acts 22:5; 26:11 in verbal form. The rarity of these words should perhaps remind us of the fact that judgment is God's "***strange work***", something He would rather not have to do. Isa. 28:21; Ezek. 18:23,32.

It will be necessary to consult the authorities, but in doing so we must endeavor to see with our own eyes and not theirs. And our eyes will see no more of truth than others save as the eyes of our understanding (lit. heart) are enlightened by fellowship with the Father and the Son. Eph. 1:18; I John 1:7.

Thayer's Lexicon defines the verb *koladzo* thus: 1 prop. prune, as trees. 2. to check, curb, restrain. 3. to chastise, correct, punish: so in N. T., 2 Pet. 2:9; Acts 4:21.

That definition of the verb, as we shall see later, fits in exactly with our interpretation of Matt. 25:46.

He treats the noun *kolasis* as follows: *correction, punishment, penalty,* and quotes Matt. 25:46. In a note he says:

Synonyms—kolais, kolasis, timoria: the noted definition of Aristotle which distinguishes kolasis and timoria as that which is disciplinary and has reference to the good of him who suffers, while the latter is penal and has reference to the satisfaction of him who inflicts, may be found in his rhet. 1, 10, 17.

This ought to satisfy every enquiring mind as to the classical use of the word *kolasis,* namely, that it expresses the idea of correction, or punishment, with a view to the good of the individual on whom the punishment falls.

Dr. Vincent is strangely inconsistent here. After his excellent remarks on "everlasting destruction", 2 Thess. 1:9, one might well expect him to apply

the same process of logical reasoning to Matt. 25:46. Here is what he says on Heb. 10:29:

"The distinction sometimes asserted between *timoria, retribution,* and *kolasis, chastisement* for the amendment of the subject, does not hold in N. T. Neither *kolasis* nor *koladzein* convey any sense of chastisement." Acts 4:21; 2 Pet. 2:9; Matt. 25:46; I John 4:18."

We see here how he contradicts Aristotle, and we shall see later how he contradicts the Scriptures. I wish to remark in passing that the Scriptural use of these two Greek words does not lend the slightest support to the traditional form in which the doctrine of eternal punishment has been held. This will become apparent in our exposition a little later.

When we miss our way in reasoning on any subject the most common cause of our deviation from the straight path is that somewhere at the basis of our logical process there is an unwarranted assumption. In the case before us the unwarranted assumption is that 2 Pet. 2:9 and Heb. 10:29 are spoken in reference to sinners, and has therefore nothing to do with Christians. But the reverse is the truth.

Peter's Second Epistle, while intended for the guidance and comfort of God's true people all through the dispensation, has special reference to the end of the age, the days we are living in and those immediately to follow. "***Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts***". 2 Pet. 3:3. We do not need to deny that this has an application to sinners, but this is not the governing thought in the Apostle's mind. In 2Pet. 1:19 he refers to the deep darkness in which the world during this age must lie because of the fact that its ruling prince is Satan; and warns the faithful that their security must be found in giving prayerful attention to "***the sure word of prophecy***", the very thing which Christians are careful not to do, and which the leaders of the people generally will not do. The result is that the heart is not cleansed according to I John 1:7, and in this state becomes and remains the very soil in which the enemy loves to sow the seeds of error, and to cultivate that which he has sown until he brings it to maturity. Then in 2:1 he speaks of the false teachers and their followers who bring shame and disgrace to the cause of Christ. Are these false teachers in the church? Of course they are. Have they the free gift of eternal life? They may have it. The general conditions then are the same now, only more aggravated and nearer the crisis point. Peter says that many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the truth shall be evil spoken of. Is this language not generally true of professing Christians today?

In 2Pet. 2:15 he says these false teachers have "***forsaken the right way***". Could this be affirmed of any unsaved person. Can sinners forsake the right way when they have never known it. How expressive are the words "the wages of unrighteousness". The temptation to hold back and hold down the

truth for the sake of material advantage never was stronger than it is today. But this is only one of a trinity of temptations which always work hand in hand to seduce the servants of Christ. They are (1) indifference to the blood of atonement; (2) the love of money; and (3) ecclesiastical ambition. See Jude 11. Listen again: "***These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the midst of darkness is reserved for the*** (millennial) ***age***". The false translation "***for ever***" justified the assumption that Peter was speaking of sinners. 2 Pet. 2:17. Do you reply, "but the R. V. omits for ever"? Very true. Nevertheless, as he is speaking of believers, even though in a backslidden state, is not the idea implied as the necessary completion of the predicate "is reserved"? This view is confirmed by Jude 13, and Matt. 22:13; and is sustained by the analogy of God's dealings with His ancient people. Heb. 2:1-3; John 6:49. The severest penalty threatened against the unfaithful Israelite was to be "***cut off from the congregation***". Lev. 17:10; 20:3-6. This carries with it the implication of exclusion from the Messianic Kingdom. Read I Cor. 10:1-10. Thus we may affirm, in opposition to Dr. Vincent, that both *timoria* and *kolasis* are used in the Scriptures with reference to the chastisement of (carnal) believers. That the sufferings implied in this state of chastisement are in a sense penal, there can be no doubt. We therefore conclude that the so-called "***eternal punishment***" of the goats is not "***eternal***", but age-lasting. And this for the reason also that the word *kolasis* is used only of discipline with a view to the salvation (in either a primary, or secondary sense) of the individual.

Let us now examine the processes and conclusions of Archbishop Trench as set forth in his "New Testament Synonyms" on the subject in hand. Here we will find a pathetic example of the blinding, benumbing effect of devotion to the traditions of men. I quote his remarks in part only.

TIMORIA, KOLASIS.

"***In timoria, according to its classical use, the vindictive character of the punishment is the predominant thought. In kolasis, on the other hand, is more the notion of punishment as it has reference to the correction and bettering of the offender, and naturally has for the most part a milder use than timoria***". That is good. Now listen to the following:

It would be a very serious error, however, to attempt to transfer this distinction in its entireness to the words as employed in the N. T. The *kolasis aiōnios* of Matt. 25:46, as is plain, is not merely corrective, and therefore temporary, discipline; cannot be any other than the *adeialeiptos timoria* (Josephus), the *aidioi timoriai* (Plato), with which the Lord elsewhere threatens **finally impenitent men** (Mark 9:43-48).

Surely that is a fine example of “begging the question” by means of artistic word juggling in order to bolster up and propagate a baseless theory, and a pet illusion of the Dark Ages. I sincerely desire to respect scholarship, and will ever seek to do so when the facts justify it. But it is as pathetic as it is tragical to see scholarship prostituted to the service of the powers of darkness in the obscuration and perversion of the truth of God’s word, and especially so as it bears on the awfully solemn realities of the future state. In this respect the educational leaders of the Lord’s people in the present Christian age are in perfect accord with those of the past Jewish age. It would require too much space to fully expose the fallacies apparent and involved in the above quotation, and so I leave it to the intelligent reader to judge for himself. Let me offer just one remark: Read the last three words of the quotation thus: “**finally impenitent (carnal) believers**”, and the fallacy becomes condemningly transparent. How much more becoming, both as a man and a Christian, when this distinguished Churchman could not reconcile his philology and theology, if he had resolved to remodel and recast the latter even to its very foundations. No doubt this is his own conviction today. The most imperative need of the Kingdom of God all down the ages has been that of men who will rightly interpret the Oracles of the Most High, first in the abstract forms of consistent harmonious thought; and then, and at the same time, in the concrete of a holy life. But it’s a costly business. Ask Paul what he thinks about it.

The point with which we are now dealing is one of strategical importance and therefore I beg the indulgence of the reader while we consult one more writer of recognized authority. I have already quoted somewhat extensively from “Old Testament Synonyms”, by Girdlestone, in an earlier chapter. In order to demonstrate more fully how unreliable and misleading are the traditional standards of critical scholarship, permit me to make a couple more extracts from the last named work as to the meaning of the Greek term *aiōnios.* On page 504 he says:

> ***"We also find the word used with reference to eternal fire, Matt. 18:8; 25:41; Jude 7; eternal punishment, Matt. 25:46; eternal judgment or condemnation, Mark 3:29; Heb. 6:2; eternal destruction, 2 Thess. 1:9. The word in these passages plainly implies finality, and signifies that when these judgments shall be inflicted, the time of probation, change, or the chance of retrieving one's fortune, will have gone by absolutely and forever. A state of existence is entered upon, which (so far as God has told us) is as hopeless as it is endless. We understand very little about the future, about the relation of human life to the rest of existence, and about the moral weight of unbelief, as viewed in the light of eternity, but we must not let our ignorance constitute us critics of God's truth. If, on the one hand, it is wrong to add to God's word, on the other we must not take away from it; and if some feel it morally impossible to hold the doctrine of eternal punishment, they must be content to wait, cleaving to the Gospel of God's love, and seeking to announce that love to others, while confessing that there is a dark background very terrible, which they are unable in their ignorance to comprehend".***

The words of Job 38:1-2, are quite appropriate right here:

> ***"Then the Lord answered job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"***

The quotation from Girdlestone is a perfect jumble of gratuitous assumptions, illogical processes, and unwarranted deductions. We may note just a few points. He assumes:

1. That the meaning of *aiōnios* in these passages is "eternal", whereas it is age-lasting.

2. That in Matt. 18:8 Christ is warning sinners, whereas He is warning selfish believers. Read from the first of the chapter. So with Heb. 6:2 and 2 Thess. 1:9.

3. That all these passages given at the beginning of the quotation have reference to eternity, whereas not one of them does so.

4. That the states thus described indicate finality of condition, whereas this is not the case unless it be in Mark 3:29.

4. He says we must not let our ignorance constitute us critics of God's truth, and in the same breath gives us a most transparent example of the very thing he condemns.

5. He confesses that this view of the character and actions of God give us a very dark background, whereas the darkness is very largely the child of his own theological fancy.

6. He warns us neither to take from nor add to the word of God, whereas he is guilty of both sins and that on a daring scale.

7. As remarked above, the one main source of all this confusion has its basis in that audacious imposture whereby traditional theology, in the name of truth and righteousness, picks up that great and grand assemblage of eschatological material which the Holy Spirit has definitely located at the close of the present dispensation, and carrying it down the stream of time one thousand years deposits it with pious genuflections at the end of the age to come. This is equally a crime against humanity and God.

We may therefore justly sum up our discussion of Matt. 25:46 in a few simple but far reaching propositions:

The eternal life spoken of is not eternal life at all, but age-lasting life.

The so-called eternal punishment is not eternal but age-lasting.

The sheep are not said to have eternal life, but they enter into it. Here, manifestly, eternal (age-lasting) life is synonymous with the Messianic Kingdom.

The sheep go into the Kingdom on its earthly side in mortal bodies, and after doing so must become the subjects of redemption. In the days of David and Solomon there must have been thousands of unsaved Israelites, but they were all in the Kingdom as privileged citizens, and in this they were greatly blessed.

The punishment inflicted on the goats is both penal and disciplinary. It is with a view to their ultimate individual salvation. But an unyielding will on their part may resist the will of God. In that case their opportunity must forever pass away.

Both classes must ultimately appear at the Great White Throne judgment for confirmation in the faith of Christ, or for irrevocable condemnation.

A GOSPEL OF SANCTIFIED OPTIMISM.

I will conclude this chapter with a very radical and at the same time a very comprehensive statement of impregnable FACT based on the Scriptures of Truth. My statement must of necessity be very brief; but when the proper time comes it will admit of abundant defence and glorious expansion. I will first put it in the form of a definite and easily intelligible proposition, and then adduce some Scriptural facts in its support.

I freely admit that we must be careful to avoid mere rationalistic speculation on so momentous a subject as human destiny. But seeing that traditional theology has speculated so much and so recklessly, it behooves

every real lover of truth and righteousness to make the very best use possible of all the material at his disposal in the word of God, that we may to some extent illuminate the fearfully dark background which everywhere accompanies the picture which traditional theology has for centuries wickedly associated with the character of God. To see God and know Him as revealed in the history of redemption, and as unfolded in type, in promise, in prophecy, in covenant, and in the various phases of the Kingdom, is the one aim of this book. I therefore ask for an attentive and unbiased hearing as I formulate the following proposition and then proceed to demonstrate its Scriptural validity. It is this:

No Son Of Adam Who Has Ever Lived, Or Does Now Live, Or Shall Yet Live, Can Be Lost Eternally Without First Having A Definite Opportunity Of Knowing Christ And His Sacrificial Death On Behalf Of The Race, And By A Deliberate Act Of Will And Personal Choice Determining For Himself Whether He Will Accept The Saviour Of Men; And If Such Opportunity Does Not Occur While In The Body And On The Earth, It Must Be Found In The Intermediate State.

I hold that all the heathen who have died, or may yet die, in helpless ignorance of Christ and His wondrous revelation of the love of God, can by no means perish eternally till they have had this revelation and have dealt with it on the grounds of personal responsibility and intelligent choice. And if within the pale of Christendom there be any (I do not say there are) who in God's estimate have not had a real opportunity of knowing Christ and His Great Salvation, they must yet have it. Inasmuch as God has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth it follows that He will do all in His power to save to the uttermost short of forcing the will of His creatures.

On reading the above not a few will at once reply, "Then you believe in a second chance for the sinner." Will all such please read again both in the lines and between the lines of the above propositions and then say where you find such a thought.

Nevertheless there are those of whom I can affirm that they will have a second chance. 1. The Jewish Nation will have a second chance. Isa. 40—66; and Rom. 9—11. 2. At least ninety per cent of the actual membership of the Christian Church of this dispensation will sorely need a second chance; and they will get it. Not a second chance for the gift of eternal life, nor yet a second chance for the prize; but a second chance to fit themselves for the presence of a Holy God. Heb. 12:14. But by the time they are ready for such high honor the Messianic Kingdom proper shall have run its course. This is a momentous question and ought to have at least a whole chapter for its treatment. Only the barest outline can be now given; but enough can be said to convince the unbiased reader that we have common sense,

reason and Scripture on our side. Can the orthodox theory boast of any one of the three?

As to common sense, by which I mean humane sentiment, where is the man who denies to the heathen the possibility of a chance, one chance, of being saved, who will dare for a moment to put himself in the place of the heathen, and with sufficient of human compassion in his heart to realize ever so imperfectly how unutterably awful is the position of one helplessly and innocently exposed to the terrors of an eternal hell, and yet not wish that he himself might have just such a chance? And what about the Golden Rule in this connection? Shall we not do to others as we would that they should do to us. In the light of the Golden Rule both Calvinism and Arminianism are seen to be destitute of humane sentiment. The Christ had limitless compassion on the multitude; but where He had pity they have only curses, the anathema of a hopeless, conscienceless doom.

Then as to the fact of reason I ask: Is Nature reasonable, or is it not? Of course it is. Who has ever discovered anything unreasonable in the relations of numbers and in the principles of mathematics? Is not the whole structure of modern science based on the assumption that Nature throughout her whole length and breadth is supremely, universally and benevolently reasonable? The aim of philosophy is to discover and correlate the great principles which lie at the basis of all the sciences; and the man who denies the fundamental unity and harmony of these principles cannot take even one step towards the desired goal. Not only so, but by the denial of this scientific axiom he must give himself up to the most hopeless scepticism, and to the despair of an universal infidelity. Even in the construction of a theology based on revelation the investigator cannot dispense with the intuitive facts and forces that are native to the soul; for they supply the subjective ground and justification of an objective and supernatural revelation. And is not the God of Nature also the God of Redemption? But I am quite willing to make the appeal wholly to the Scriptures. This atmosphere is most congenial of all.

And why does the typical theologian hold and teach that the heathen are eternally lost? The most candid and truthful answer that can be given to that question is that he inherited the dogma from his lineal ecclesiastical ancestors. I once heard a profound thinker deliver a lecture on the science of political economy in which he pointed out the need of certain legislation in order to open the way and give effect to the laws of nature; but at this point he found that the politicians systematically blocked the way in the interests of class legislation. Then, dropping his voice to a lower key, he added deliberately and sententiously: “The politician is not a pathfinder”. And the same self evident truth may, with even greater felicity, be applied to the typical theologian. He, above all men, is not a path-finder, unless it be the path of ease, of compromise, and of accommodation to the shifting

standards of conventionality. The history of the Church for eighteen hundred years buttresses this statement with an invincible “Amen”. “But there have been exceptions”, you say. Yes, indeed, and let us never cease to thank the Lord for them, even though they have seldom attained to greater dignity among the powers that be than that of voices crying in the world’s great wilderness of organized sham, fascinating illusion, and poorly veneered hypocrisy. The enslavement of the theological and religious leaders of the Lord’s people to the traditions of men and the spirit of the age in which they have lived is one of the most pathetic and tragical facts in the history of Judaism and of Christianity.

But some one may say, Is it really a fact that representative teachers of the orthodox schools give the heathen over to a hopeless future state? I will give just one example:

“The argument respecting the future state of the heathen may be stated in a few words: 1. There can be no doubt that they are sinners. They have broken the law of God,-that law which is written on the heart of every human being. 2. Having broken the law of God, they are exposed to its penalty, which is eternal death. 3. This penalty they must suffer unless they are forgiven. 4. They cannot be forgiven unless they repent. 5. With few exceptions, here and there, they give no evidence of repentance, but the most painful evidence to the contrary. 6. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that the great body of the heathen, throughout the world, live and die in sin, and perish for ever. (Pond’s Christian Theology, page 595. Dr. R. A. Torrey takes the same view).

Will this statement of the case stand the test of common sense, of reason, or of Scripture? Let us see:

To the first proposition I say, Amen. That goes without saying. But we will see to it that any deduction he draws from this is valid.

The second proposition is a transparent non sequitur. It does not follow. The Bible says the wages of sin is death. Why add the word “eternal”? And if we permit its use as legitimate, what is its meaning in this connection? And, again, suppose we grant that the wages of sin is “eternal death”, the question still remains, What effect had the death of Christ on that fact, even though the heathen have never heard of atonement by substitution? And is there any place within the lids of the Bible where it is positively affirmed, or even implied, that the heathen are never to have a chance to accept the sacrifice of Christ. Thus we see that the second proposition is full of gratuitous assumptions.

The third proposition assumes that they cannot be forgiven except while on earth and in the mortal body. This position is absolutely without Scriptural support. We shall see later irresistible evidence to the contrary. The same reply is equally appropriate to the fourth proposition; and also to the fifth.

Besides, this may be applied to the great majority of Christians, and "with a few exceptions, here and there, they give no evidence of repentance."

Consequently the conclusion contained in the sixth proposition is absolutely invalid, a mere begging of the whole question.

SOME PERTINENT FACTS.

1. Since the fall of the first pair all men are conceived and born in sin.

2. For this very potent fact they are not morally responsible.

3. Moral depravity is innate, constitutional, ineradicable and universal. For this fact also, as such, they are not morally responsible. Sin in the flesh is one thing, but sin manifest through the flesh is another. The latter only, involves volition.

4. In addition to facts 1 and 3, there is the damaging complementary fact that mankind are born into a world which is under the curse of God because of the sin of the first man. No moral responsibility can attach to any living man on this account.

5. The world, within certain prescribed limits, is controlled and governed by the Devil and his demon spirits. No responsibility attaches to any living human being for this fact.

6. The reason the heathen have never had a chance to accept the redemption that is in Christ is because the Church has utterly failed in her duty towards them. This is a great sin, for the evangelization of the world was her supreme mission in this age. For this state of things the heathen are not responsible.

7. If the Gospel, which has not reached the heathen here, cannot reach them in the intermediate state, that fact will in no way involve them in moral responsibility on that account. God foresaw all this and provided for it. The end includes the means. As I contemplate the above facts, free from sentimentality, the solemn impression is borne in upon my soul that it will be more tolerable for heathen China, India and Japan, than for Christian (?) America, England, Germany; more tolerable even for the heathen than for the professing Church. Is not this implied in Matt. 11:20-23; Gal. 5:19-21 and Heb. 10:26-31 ? Multitudes of Christians are almost certain to find themselves excluded from the Messianic Kingdom for this sin of inhumanity even if there were none other charged against them.

Prompted by the frivolous spirit which Paul condemns in Rom. 6:1, someone will reply, Then, if the heathen are to have a chance in the intermediate state, why go to the expense and trouble of giving them the Gospel now? I answer:

1. The Master says, "***Go ye therefore, and teach all nations***". He also says, "***Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into His harvest***".

2. What moral significance there is in the following interrogation: "***Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?***" How searchingly do these imperative, unqualified commands and that stinging interrogation expose the heartless hypocrisy of all such trifling with the verities of God's word.

3. Does not the fact that I have this salvation of Christ put me under the most solemn obligation to give it to those who have it not, apart from any positive injunction from the Master?

4. Does not my sanctification and qualification for a place in the first resurrection depend on my obedience to the word and Spirit of God?

5. Have not the heathen as much right as I have to run in the race for the prize?

6. It is the intention of the Father to select a bride for His Son from every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation? How can this ever come to pass unless the Gospel is universally proclaimed?

7. The second advent of Messiah cannot come to put an end to the wicked "Times of the Gentiles" until "this Gospel of the Kingdom be preached among all nations for a witness."

Thus the attempt to found a plea of indifference and unconcern, as regards the heathen, on our doctrine in order to reduce it to ridicule and contempt, is wholly without warrant.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

Will the reader follow closely, critically, honestly, in the path now about to be outlined.

1. The Scriptures affirm that (in the purpose of God) the Blood of Christ was shed from the foundation of the world.

The eschatological potentiality of this fact is beyond human comprehension. The progressive unfolding of this affirmation in the history of redemption so far confirms this expectation.

2. The incarnation in its ultimate analysis cannot be explained by reference to the will of God, but to the subjective necessities of the Divine Nature. God cannot deny Himself. His fathomless love had to find vent in voluntary self-manifestation. And that which explains the incarnation must be the determining factor in all the processes required to give expression to the purpose of the incarnation as conceived by the Divine Trinity.

3. That which explains the incarnation must also explain the work of creation and preservation. While creation was first in point of historical manifestation, it was second in point of Divine volition. Creation was in order to redemption; and has found its purpose and justification in providing a material platform for the objective manifestation of the greatest mystery in the universe–redemption by substitution.

4. The most fundamental element in the character of God is love. Calvinism subordinates the love of God to the will of God. Not only that, but it so exalts the Divine Will at the expense both of the Love and Wisdom of God as to make the consequent conception of Deity repulsive to the better moral instincts of humanity, and that even while in a fallen condition.

5. There is no innate, subjective antithesis between the love and justice of God. They are not two but one. But the purpose of the judgments of God, which are made necessary by His justice, is, so far as humanity is concerned, to make a way for the free flow and fuller manifestation of His love. The proof of this proposition is found in the historical fact that the heaviest judgments have always occurred at the point of transition from one age to another; and they have invariably been followed by a fuller manifestation of Grace. There is incalculable eschatological significance in this fact.

I do not deny that the gift of free agency to man may make it possible for him to defeat permanently the beneficence of the love and will of God as regards the problem of human destiny. At any rate I prefer to keep on safe ground until a fuller evolution of the history of redemption clarifies the more distant horizon. But the above propositions amply justify the conclusion that the number of the finally saved will vastly exceed the number of the finally lost.

6. It is a fact that the sufferings of Christ in life and in death were all vicarious; and that in them He tasted death for every man. Heb. 2:9. He was, and is, the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world. I John 2:1-2. God was in Christ RECONCILING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF, not imputing their sins unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. 2 Cor. 5:19.

And with infallible truth like this before our eyes are we credulous enough to believe that the heathen are today in the same place that they would have been if Christ had never suffered for the sins of the whole world, theirs included? Beyond a doubt the death of the Christ has potentially affected, in some marvelous way, the future destiny of the heathen. I have no hesitation in saying that in justice to Christ, apart altogether from justice to the heathen, the latter must, to the last man, on earth or in the intermediate state, have a personal opportunity to embrace the offer of salvation in Jesus Christ. He shall surely see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.

7. We need special supernatural illumination to hold the proper balance between Scriptures which seem to deal with the same subject in a way that would almost indicate contrast, if not contradiction. We have in Rev. 14:11 the solemn declaration, The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever (unto the ages of the ages). Over against this (in appearance) we have Paul’s very comprehensive statement in Rom. 5:18:

"Therefore as by the offense of one (man) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Man) the free gift came upon all men UNTO JUSTIFICATION OF LIFE".

8. There can be no denying that the "all" of the first part and the "all" of the second part form a perfect equation. Grant this, and it logically follows, that the vicarious atonement effected on Calvary by the Son of Man has fundamentally affected the relation of God to mankind universally, including all the heathen who have ever lived. And if you reply that the objective provision of salvation in Christ does not constitute a guarantee on God's part that it will be subjectively experienced by any man, I answer: (1) It guarantees that some will of necessity be eternally saved, though the individuals may not be specified. And (2) that every man, including the heathen, must have a chance, an opportunity, to enter into the experience; otherwise the agony of Gethsemane and the horrors of Golgotha are, for the great mass of mankind, utterly abortive. But this is inconceivable. It must ever be one of the greatest joys of the Christ and of God in the ages of eternity that salvation was provided for all and offered to all. Therefore when we find apparently contrasted statements let us not emphasize either at the expense of the other. The attainment of a higher level in the progress of the history of redemption will perfectly harmonize them.

9. We are absolutely safe in affirming that, as one result of the atonement, the guilt of original sin has been removed from the fallen race individually and collectively. This fact provides a foundation and a starting point for the work of actual redemption in the race units. See props. 1, 2, 3, 4. But we must not overlook the fact that while men are not responsible for indwelling sin, they are responsible for the out breakings which may flow from it, in thought word and deed.

The Scriptures affirm that Christ put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Heb. 9:26. I grant that this was a judicial act; but also affirm that it was for the race as a whole. This is equivalent to saying that, owing to the sacrificial death of Christ, the whole of the fallen race was and is potentially saved. John 3:16. He said on the cross, "***It is finished***".

10. As a result God's attitude towards men is that of universal benevolence. "***For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.***" 1 Tim. 2:3-4. Calvinists would much rather Paul had not written that. But it remains a fact that "***whosoever will may come***".

11. We take as an axiom of sound theology that in all God's dealings with His creatures He is absolutely just and merciful. And this being so there are certain things which God cannot do and be consistent with His own holiness, that is, with Himself. For example–

He cannot fail to keep His covenant with Abraham concerning the restoration of his natural seed to the land of promise.

He cannot reject the soul who comes to him for pardon in the name of Jesus.

He cannot deny those who do not deny Him in their testimony before men. They must have a place in the first resurrection.

He cannot deny the heathen an opportunity to share in the salvation of His Son. The holiness of God demands the fourth just as really as it does the other three.

12. God is no respecter of persons; and on the basis of this great Bible fact we may take it for granted that His plan of the ages involves some means of equalizing the opportunities of men who live in different ages, and under dissimilar conditions. Contrast the superior advantages of Israel over the nations of the world at that time; also of those living in civilized parts of the world as against those who have lived in China, India and Africa. Then think of the exceeding great grace bestowed on those who shall be privileged to live on this earth during the thousand years of Messiah's Kingly Reign, when wickedness is restrained, the Devil imprisoned, and righteousness covers the earth. Only grant that the Age to Come is a time of "restitution", and universal equalization of opportunity, and accountability for those who have been favored above their fellows, and all is plain. Acts 3:21.

13. God promised Abraham that He would make him and his Seed (Christ) a blessing to all nations. This promise covers all time and all nations in the most literal sense. See props. 1-4.

14. Think of God's mercy to Paul. Acts 9. Would not this religious Jew have gone straight to perdition if God had not interfered in an unusual and supernatural way? How many millions both of Jews and Gentiles might have been saved had the same means been adopted? But He saved Paul that through him He might save others? This is Bible election.

Then think of what the Lord is yet going to do for unbelieving Israel. Zech. 10—14. Can He not be equally merciful to the Gentiles? and that even after they have passed to the under World.

> ***"It were a one-sided view to regard the Babylonish exile as only a punishment for Israel's sin. There is, in truth, nothing in all God's dealings in history exclusively punitive. That were a mere negative element. But there is always a positive element also of actual progress; a step forward, even though in the taking of it something should have to be crushed. And this step forward was the development of the idea of the kingdom of God in its relation to the world."*** Edersheim's Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. vol.1. page 162.

> ***"All the anxieties of the exiles are allayed by this betsdek[9], which traces back the revolution proceeding from Cyrus to Jehovah's righteousness, i.e., to His action as absolutely determined by love and as aiming directly at the salvation of His people, and, at bottom, of all peoples".*** Delitzsch on Isaiah 45:13.

15. The light which Christ brought to this earth, and the benefits He procured for men, He also carried to the under world and there began the work of conquest:

"***The land of Zebulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death is light sprung up.***" Matt. 4:15-16. Beyond all room for doubt we can affirm that this last clause has reference to the Hadean world; and the people who dwell there. It is highly probable that when the Saviour descended to this department of God's world He there, within certain moral and geographical limitations, actually established a ministry of the Gospel. Does the word not say that He, Himself, preached to the spirits in prison? 1 Pet. 3:17-20. The desperate efforts of the defenders of the traditional theory of human destiny to rid themselves of the Holy Spirit's testimony in this Scripture are both pathetic and ludicrous. 1 Pet. 4:6 is even more specific. I have absolutely no doubt that millions of Christians, who while on earth lived for their own selfish gratification, have, in this very abode, some measure of hope in the consolations of that ministry. Nothing could be more absurd and sentimental than the prevalent idea that when believers die they immediately enter into the presence of God and there await the resurrection of the body. According to the teaching of the Master, very, very few will have that felicity even in the Messianic Age. Matt. 7:13-14; Heb. 12:14. We must not confound "present with the Lord," and "present with Jesus Christ"-the God-man. The latter is localized.

The Holy Spirit though Ezekiel gives at least one concrete case of the restoration of one of the wickedest of heathen communities to the enjoyment of Gospel privileges in the Age to Come.

"***When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them.***" Ezek. 16:55. So, even the people of Sodom are to have a chance.

---

[9] "All the anxieties of the exiles are calmed by the words '**in righteousness**,' which trace back the revolutions that Cyrus was causing to the righteousness of Jehovah, i.e., to His interposition, which was determined by love alone, and tended directly to the salvation of His people, and in reality to that of all nations."

"When they were filled He said unto the disciples, "***Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost***". John 6:12. Is it possible that the Christ can be so careful for a few crumbs of bread, which can know neither sorrow nor pain, and yet be so prodigal of millions of souls whose nature He assumed and whose sins He bore on the Cross, as traditional orthodoxy would have us believe? And Paul puts the pregnant interrogation; Doth God care for oxen? And the Prince of Life Himself said, ***I have compassion on the multitude***.

> ***"And God said to Jonah, Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? And he said, I do well to be angry, even unto death. Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not labored, neither madest it to grow; which came up in a night and perished in a night. And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six-score thousand persons who cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"*** Jonah 4:9-11.

Yes, indeed, the heathen must have a chance to know and experience the marvelous love of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. The Christ will be the judge in that Great Day, but it will be on the basis of mercy offered and accepted or rejected by a personal and intelligent act of choice. I cannot but regard it as radically wrong to say with Calvinism, that God, had He so decreed, could have left the whole race to perish in its sinful and helpless condition. On this point the Arminian is undoubtedly right; the race and, indeed, the individual, have certain claims upon their Creator which He will not and can not ignore. Deny this and there is no escape from the most soulless fatalism the human mind can conceive.

Having read this chapter, I ask the reader to interrogate his own reason and conscience in the light of the facts and principles set forth, and as far as possible in freedom from religious bias, and then give his honest judgment as to whether the views herein contained, or the orthodox, do most honor to the LOVE, wisdom, power and justice of God.

In the spring of 1915 I met a returned missionary from India, one of many years experience. She had heard something of my teaching along these lines and wanted more definite information. I gave her a very brief outline as above. She replied: "If that be true it will help me greatly in dealing with the heathen". Then she told me the following story:

"A few years ago I met a very highly educated Indian, and proceeded to press on his attention the claims of the Gospel." He replied," I will have absolutely nothing to do with your religion. Christianity does not commend itself to me, and I will not have it". I said, "Will you then be kind enough to tell me why you take so decided an attitude against Christianity?" He

replied quickly, “I will. My father and my mother died in total ignorance of this Gospel you bring to us; so did all my ancestors for thousands of years, and your Christianity tells me they have all gone to an endless Hell. That’s why I do not believe, and will not have anything to do with your religion”. Then said the missionary, “What could I say? I was dumb”. Yes, indeed, what could she say? unless with a heart of stone she had, in the real spirit of Calvinistic fatalism, replied,” Since God ordains whatsoever comes to pass, no doubt He has ordained this also, and so the best thing you can do is to show your submission to the will of the eternal God by silently and reverently submitting to His inscrutable decree”. But even God is subject to Law–the Law of His own Holiness. “But if”, said the missionary, “what you tell me is true I want to know all about it, for then I shall have an answer for the next man I meet of that class.” The following chapter will throw some light on this very problem. In the meantime let us believe that the true Christian’s God is One “***Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth***”. 1 Tim. 2:4. Dr. A. A. Hodge says this does not mean what it says. But we appeal from the man at the circumference to the man at the centre–Paul, the bond slave of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER 6:
THE FALLACY OF CALVINISM OR THE CALLED AND THE CHOSEN.

"Augustine, whose method was the vicious one of all dogmatists, which is first to lay down certain propositions, which are little else than our own philosophical conceptions, and then turn to the Bible for verbal proof of these rash overreachings beyond that which is written, is thus an example and a warning. In his Enchiridion[10] he piles up one assumption on another till we stand amazed at what a flimsy support the whole structure of his theology rests on. ...Is it accidental-we think not-that three Carthaginian doctors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, are responsible for that arbitrary magisterial view of religion which is more Roman than Roman law itself? This is too often the colonial type of mind, to exaggerate the qualities of the mother country. American Puritanism ran to seed the home type of Calvinism, as we know, before the middle of the last century. Predestinarianism in New England reached its last term of Determinism, in which that pure and spiritual conception of election, as the progressive purpose of God to redeem the many through the few, which runs like a river through Holy Writ, is lost in the sands of a dark and hopeless fatalism. This was the point reached by Jonathan Edwards, when the outraged public conscience took the matter in hand, and restored the balance by asserting the suppressed truth. It reasserted all the moral attributes of Deity. It set up a form of Deism which for the time concealed, if it did not deny, these Trinitarian truths to which a dominant Calvinism had given a twist."—J. B. Heard.[11]

The amount of Scriptural material available as evidence in proof of our main thesis grows upon me daily; and so fascinating is the study that it is difficult to take time to write. But I trust that enough has been said already to convince the unbiased reader, and especially the God-fearing Bible student, of the far reaching effect of our exegesis on the subject of Biblical Eschatology, and beyond that on the whole question of Biblical Interpretation.

The theme of this chapter is found in Matt. 22:1-14, and particularly in the last verse-the 14th.

---

[10] **enchiridion** /ˌɛnkʌɪˈrɪdɪən/ ▶ noun (pl. **enchiridions** or **enchiridia** /-dɪə/) formal a book containing essential information on a subject.**– origin** late Middle English: via late Latin from Greek *enkheiridion*, from *en-* 'within' + *kheir* 'hand' + the diminutive suffix *-idion*.[Oxford Dictionary of English © Oxford University Press 2010]

[11] Quoted, 7-19-2021, from: "Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted" on Google books; https://books.google.com.sb/books?id=71BLAwAAQBAJ&lpg=PP1&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q=American%20Puritanism%20&f=false

These solemn and profoundly significant words were uttered by our Saviour very shortly before His passion; and as a fitting climax to the Parable He added the trenchant words, "For many are called, but few *are* chosen." Exegetes pass over these eight words as if they were a merely accidental appendage of no relative importance. We will see later what a serious mistake this is.

The relation of Matt. 22 to what precedes and follows is well worth noting. The public ministry of Christ has now lasted more than three years and in a few days He will seal the verbal testimony of His sinless life with the still more eloquent testimony of His vicarious death. Never was He more anxious than during these closing days to speak to those of His own nation of the riches of God's grace; and never did His message of mercy and His thrilling call to repentance, as the prime condition of mercy, meet with more malignant opposition and open contempt from the leaders of the people than during these pathetic and tragical days. Such strained relations between Him and the Jewish Hierarchy could not continue much longer without precipitating a bloody crisis. And they knew it quite as well as He. They were convinced that their social and religious prestige must be recovered and vindicated even though to do so necessitated the judicial murder of the Prophet of Nazareth. They resolved to take no chances.

He knew quite well that the main cause of His failure to get the ear and sympathy of the masses was chiefly owing to the attitude of their religious leaders towards Him. Hence His words of warning concerning the leaven of the Pharisees. Matt. 16:6,12. Indeed, it was with difficulty he was able to rescue the Twelve from its foul contamination. He also foretold the same evil in the present age. Matt. 13:33. But notwithstanding the admonition the deadly leavening process goes on as if never a word of warning had been spoken.

In Matt. 19:1-2, we find the Man of Sorrows heading towards Jerusalem for the last time. On the way He speaks several parables all of which were calculated to exhibit the supreme folly of the Jews in their rejection of Him as their Messiah, and thereby their forfeiture of the Messianic Kingdom. One of the most pathetic events of that day was His meeting with the Rich Young Ruler, and the turning away of the questioner with unutterable sorrow in his heart, unable to realize that his grief was entirely owing to mistaken views of life. So it is today. What a contrast we have in Phil. 3:7-14.

In Matt. 21:1-11 Christ fulfills the prophecy in Zech. 9:9.

> ***"Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, Meek, and riding upon an ass, And upon a colt the foal of an ass".***

Let the reader put the above prophecy side by side with passages like Matt. 2:1-2; John 1:41,49, and then ask himself if these prophecies are substantial facts or mere fictions; and if facts have they been fulfilled, and if not-when will they?

But when the elders, priests and high priests heard the reception given Israel's King as He entered the City and the people shouted, "***Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest***", their envy and malice knew no bounds. On the other hand what a fearless and fearful indictment of the religious leaders of His day is that contained in Matt. 23. May we not fail to see in these scathing words of inspired denunciation the typical reference to and prophetic forecast of a still more severe declaration of righteous wrath to be pronounced on another generation at His second advent. For "***If they do these things in the green tree what shall be done in the dry?***"

We will now come to the subject matter of our study. Matt. 22:1-14.

THE MARRIAGE FEAST AND THE WEDDING GARMENT.

"And Jesus answering, spake to them again in parables, saying, 'The Kingdom of the Heavens is likened to a Man—a King—Who made a Marriage-Feast for His Son; and He sent forth His servants to call them who had already been called to the Marriage-Feast, and they were not willing to come. Again He sent forth other servants saying, "Speak to those who have been called, 'Behold, I have made ready my Dinner, my oxen and the fatlings have been killed, and all things are ready, come ye to the Marriage-Feast." But they, neglecting it, went away, one indeed to his own farm and another to his merchandise; and the rest having laid hold on His servants, maltreated and slew them. And the King was enraged, when He heard this, and having sent forth His soldiers He destroyed those murderers and set their City on fire. Then said the King to His servants, "The Marriage-Feast, indeed, is ready, but they which had been called were not worthy. Be going, therefore, into the crossways of the roads; and as many soever as ye may find, call into the Marriage-Feast." And those servants, having gone forth to the ways, did gather all, as many as they found, both bad and good, and the banqueting hall was filled with those reclining. And the King, entering in to inspect the guests, saw there a man who had neglected to put on a wedding robe; and He says to him, "Friend, how did you come in here not having on a wedding-robe?" And he was speechless. Then said the King to the ministers, "Binding him feet and hands, cast him forth into the outer darkness, there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth; for many are called but few are chosen."'" Matt. 22:1-14.**{***cf.* Zeph. 1:7-8. -esn**}**

It is of prime importance to note right here that the parable has a two-fold application: First, to the Jews at our Lord's first advent; and, second, to the Christian Church at His second advent.

It is a common remark among certain students of the word that this or that Scripture is for the Jews, and to assume that thereby the Christian need not pay any attention to its admonition, or rebuke. This is a dangerous business. Let there be no doubt in the reader's mind that owing to the fact of his having greater light the above parable has a more searching application to the Christian than it had to the Jew of our Lord's Day.

EXPOSITION.

The value or utility of exposition is found in its application. The exposition of a given portion of Scripture may exhibit scholarship of a high order, and

a mind trained in the subtleties of abstract thought; and yet, if the exegesis proceed on the assumption that the author had in his mind an object and a purpose entirely different, and even opposite to the real one, the exposition will be practically useless. We have already had an example of this in our study of the Rich Ruler. Our present study will afford us another example of the same kind. And it will be found that the vitiating presupposition is the same in both cases; that is, that the application is to the sinner while in reality it is to the children of God. That which was a fundamental weakness in the typical Jew while reading his Bible, is equally apparent in the history of biblical interpretation during the present Church Age; that is, the disposition, the desire, to pass over and get rid of all portions of God's word of truth and righteousness which speak of judgment on God's people. It is doubtful if there is a single writer of repute from the fourth century onwards in whom this innate tendency is not more or less visible. I do not mean to say that it was intentionally so in all cases. Habits of thought may become cruel masters.

The substance of the parable seems to me to be as follows: The King Who makes the Marriage-Feast is God the Father. The Son for Whom it is made is God the Son, even the Son of Man. The guests who are called to the Marriage-Feast are primarily the Jews, and they alone among the nations of the world.

The Banqueting Hall is the Messianic Kingdom with the Christ as the Son of David reigning on David's Throne 1 Chr. 29:23; Luke 1:31-33. The Joy of the Marriage Feast is the inconceivable felicity of the Messianic Kingdom when such portions of Scripture as Psalms 8; 16; 45; 72; 89 will be literally realized. See also Rev. 21:9 to Rev. 22:14.

Two calls are clearly set forth in the parable:

First, when God through Moses and Aaron called the people of Israel out of Egypt, and took them to be, His people, saying, to Pharaoh, "Let My people go." The permanence of the call is assumed by all the prophets.

Second, when the Christ came to the Jews, presenting Himself as their long promised Messiah, and for the purpose of fulfilling the Davidic and Abrahamic Covenants in the actual establishment of the Messianic Kingdom according to the teaching of the Fathers of Israel and their Prophets. Amos 9:11-15; Acts 15:13-18. This, of course, would involve the raising of the faithful dead up to that time. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would then come into the inheritance. Gen. 15:8.

The preaching of Christ and His Apostles was the second call. This was not a call out of Egypt and it was, not a call to salvation in the first degree, for from the Exodus onward the nation was regarded as saved in that sense. Even when in a state of sin and growing apostasy they are still addressed by the prophets as the people of God. Isa. 1:3; 3:12-15; 5:1-13. Neither was the second call to be interpreted as a transference from one condition in

the flesh to another in the same. It was rather a call to come out of an earthly state and into a heavenly state, where the raised would live in immortal bodies and enjoy perfect communion with God.

How absurd then to apply the parable to the sinner-the unsaved. It has nothing to do with such. The Holy Spirit says, "***He came unto His own*** (possessions-*idia*), ***and His own*** (people-*idioi*) ***received Him not.***" The Messiah began His preaching with the words, "**Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.**" This too was the message of the Baptist. The establishment of the Kingdom and thereby the accomplishment of the promises made to Abraham and David was impossible except on the basis of repentance and a mighty turning to God. But when Israel's Messiah pointed out the sins of the nation, especially of the leaders, which must be abandoned or the Kingdom postponed,[12] their latent wickedness came into open expression. Men in Israel, as in the Church, had no appreciation of spiritual values, with the result that when the call to victory and glory came "**they would not come.**" It was too Utopian to be true, they thought. They loved the visible, the tangible, the sensible; and so, "**One went to his own farm.**" He could speak of his earthly possessions as "his own", something get-at-able; but the verities of Messiah's Kingdom did not appeal to him. He could say, "my farm", but he could not say, "my God". The Patriarchs could and did. Gen. 17:3-23; 28:13-22; Psalm 7:1-11.

The Theocratic Kingdom from Moses to the last king on David's Throne, previous to the Babylonian Captivity, was a type, or was intended to be a type of Messiah's Kingdom; and it was so to a very considerable extent during the reigns of David and Solomon–but only a type. How unwise, and indeed wicked, to deny the literality of the Anti-type.

As we have already remarked, the first call was given by Moses and Aaron; and it was an effectual call. The aim of the prophets in Israel was to keep alive the Messianic Hope, but it was a difficult task owing to the materialistic and polytheistic tendencies of the people. Listen to Isaiah:

---

[12][Nowhere in scripture have I found the option of a "postponed kingdom;" which the Jewish leaders were apparently trying to opt for by opting out of the kingdom John and Jesus were preaching. Were they actually being given a choice? It was coming, ready or not and whether they wanted it or not and was actually already there. "***The kingdom exists today in the person of the King, Christ, and the ruling class He is now calling out.***" See "THE KINGDOM POSTPONED?" *Excerpt from* ***"Rice-Smith Discussion"*** *by Elder C. A. Smith, 1936;* J. R. Graves, L. L. C., G. E. Jones, C. A. Smith, etc. (n.d.). The 3 Stages of Christ's Kingdom. -esn]

> ***"And in this mountain (Jerusalem) shall Jehovah of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all peoples, and the wail that is spread overall nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and Jehovah God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of His people (Israel) shall He take away from off the earth for Jehovah hath spoken it."*** Isa. 25:6-8.

The second call, if accepted, would have accomplished all this for the Jews. Alas! how blind the people were and hence the lament of the prophet:

> ***"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for Jehovah hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me. The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider."***

But the servants of the King who gave the second call to the Marriage-Feast, as no longer now a thing of hope and prophecy, but as at hand, were the Twelve Apostles and the Seventy along with a few others, Yea, and even the Master Himself, for He took the place of a servant. Isa. 52:13. What supreme delight, what infinite felicity lay bound up in that call; and what centuries of unutterable sorrow the nation of the Jews might have been spared had they accepted it! Who could foresee it all but He who uttered the parable; but He did. Who shall ever fathom the depth of pathos contained in the words:

> ***"Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."***

Alas! how desolate the City, the Land, the People, for these nineteen hundred years. But the third call is just at hand, and it will not be given to the dispersed of Israel by servants (douloi), but by Messiah Himself:

> ***"And His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east", "and I will pour upon the House of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born."*** Zech. 14:4; 12:10.

Till then the vail will remain on God's ancient People, and till then the covering will remain on the eyes of the Gentile nations. 2 Cor. 3:14; Isa. 25:7. There is absolutely no deliverance for the latter except through converted and restored Israel, and no conversion of Israel till they literally look upon Him whom they pierced.

There is a marked difference in the recorded treatment of the servants of the King. It is not necessarily implied that all of those who refused the second call did so with any conscious enmity in their hearts. Comparing what they had in possession with what the Messiah offered, they preferred to have things remain as they were. We find the same truth in the Parable of the Great Supper. Luke 14:15-24:

"***When one of them that sat at meat with Him heard these things he said unto Him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God*** (Messiah's Kingdom). ***Then said He unto him. A certain man made a Great Supper, and called many; and He sent forth His servant at the hour of the supper to say to those who had been invited, Come, because all things are now ready. And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said to Him, I bought a field, and I must go out to see it; I pray you, have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to prove them, I pray you, have me excused. And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come***".

Now it ought to be apparent on the very surface that the Great Supper cannot be salvation as now enjoyed on earth even by the most spiritual of God's people. It is that conception of salvation which will be realized when Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the overcomers of all dispensations are raised from the dead, and when Messiah's Kingdom is established over the whole earth and Satan and his demon spirits are bound in the Abyss. This and nothing less was what the Rich Young Ruler had in his mind when he asked the Master what he must do in order to qualify himself for the Great Supper.

But while some of the called treated the invitation with mere indifference and preferred the life (psuke) of the fallen Adam to the life (zoe) of the incarnate Christ, it was not so in every case. Besides the farmers and the merchants there were others whose souls were inspired by Satanic passion, and they laid hold on the servants, maltreated them and finally slew them. They were the leaders of the people and especially the priests and high priests; the very ones who ought to have been the first to hail the advent of David's Greater Son. Hence the righteous indignation of Matt. 23. See also what immediately precedes and follows our parable of the Marriage for the King's Son. Compare Matt. 20:1-16.

A few words from Alford on Matthew's Gospel may be helpful:

> ***"The whole narrative proceeds more upon a Jewish view of matters, and is concerned more to establish that point, which to a Jewish convert would be most important,-that Jesus was the Messiah prophesied in the Old Testament. Hence the commencement of the genealogy from Abraham and David; hence the frequent notice of this or that happening because it was foretold; hence the constant opposition of our Lord's spiritually ethical teaching to the carnal formalistic ethics of the Scribes and Pharisees."***

Nothing could be clearer than that the main purpose of Matthew was to establish the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be the promised Messiah and therefore the LITERAL King of the Jews and the Fulfiller of the Davidic and Abrahamic Covenants.

But since God had set the Jewish Nation aside and the Christian Church had taken the place of testimony for God in the earth, what end was to be served by calling the attention of Jewish converts to the Messianic claims of the Christ? Why, manifestly to show to the seed of Abraham that as a Nation they were not cast off forever, but only for the present parenthetical Church Age, at the end of which the Church would be removed and Israel (the whole twelve tribes) be restored to the honorable place of testimony, and that in the abiding fullness of Pentecostal power, and in which they, if faithful, would reign with the Christ, the Messiah, on His Millennial Throne. In other words, if the postponement of the Messianic Kingdom was rendered necessary by the unbelief of the Jews as a corporate body, that fact, though much to be regretted because of the suffering of the Nation while in a state of judicial blindness and contempt among the Gentile nations, in no way invalidated the specific contents of the two above mentioned Covenants, but simply postponed their fulfillment and the consequent blessing to the whole world. To Patriarchs and Prophets and to the Jews of our Lord's Day, including the Apostles, the Messiah was to be a literal, anointed King, reigning on or through, the Throne of David. The spiritualized conception which began to come into vogue in the second century, and was almost universally prevalent in the fourth, never entered the mind of any honest Jew previous to the crucifixion of Christ. The Old Testament Scriptures know absolutely nothing of such a wicked departure from the truth, and the Covenants as revealed to the Fathers. It remained for the woman, the Church, to mix the leaven of falsehood in the three measures of meal which God had given to Israel for her comfort and inspiration. But the time is near when every whit of the leaven will be purged out never to enter again.

Why is it that up to Matt. 12 not a single parable appears, and after that they are continually in evidence? Because up till that point the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom in the earth was still regarded as

a possibility. But when the Jews charged the Messiah with the accomplishment of His mighty works through demon power (Matt. 12:22-45), the Nation was temporarily cast off and the Kingdom postponed. Therefore that which was postponed is of necessity now absent, and also that which in its time must be restored. In the meantime the Gentile Nations continue their wicked course under the sovereign rule of Satan, the Prince of the power of the Air. It is not surprising that the said Nations should dislike this portentious truth; but it is surely a preposterous anachronism that the Christian Church, while professing to be Christ's witness in the earth, should hate this sublime truth even more than the Gentile Nations. If one wishes to see an example of the intensity of man's dislike of real Kingdom Truth he must turn up the pages, not of the expert in civil jurisprudence, but of the theologian. It is not necessary to give examples, at least in the present connection.

We have already remarked that the parable has a double application: First, to the Jews as a corporate body at the first Advent of Christ; Second, to the Christian at the second Advent. And the Scriptures clearly foretell the parallel in the history of the two Heaven appointed Witnesses for God in the earth-Israel and the Church. The professing Church at the close of the present age of Grace is going to be in an even worse position to meet the facts of the second advent and its awful issues than were the Jews for the first advent at the end of that age of Law. The universal tendency among preachers and expositors, when interpreting these Kingdom Parables, is to look back and find all their significance, so far as they contain words of admonition and warning, in their application to the willful and stubborn Jews of our Lord's Day on earth. This is supreme folly. Heb. 2:1-3; Rom. 2:1-11; 1 Cor. 10:1-10; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 5:19-21; Col. 3:25.

Turn up almost any commentary that comes to hand and the author will tell you that the Feast is now on, and that believers every where are sitting at the King's Table and partaking of the oxen and fatlings which He in His goodness has provided. But what are the facts? Was the first century after Pentecost a time of feasting for the Apostolic Church? Did the Apostles sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel? and did they then reign as kings according to the carnal conception of the Corinthians? Was Peter feasting or fasting when he lay in prison guarded by four quaternions of soldiers to be executed by Herod the following day in order to please the Jews? And where did Paul find time for feasting during these three arduous and perilous missionary journeys? Was it when he said:

> ***"Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep?"***

Truly, there came a time in the History of the Church when she began to feast. But it was not at the table of King of kings, but of Pagan Rome, when she “become an organized society incorporated with the political systems of the world”. But for this kind of adulterous feasting she has paid a fearful price and will pay a still greater price when she faces the issues of the Bema Judgment-not any longer as a corporate body but in her individual units who have shared the profits and emoluments of that adulterous union. Ezek. 16, Matt. 13 and Rev. 17 should be studied side by side as type and antitype. Compare also Rev. 2; 3.

In the eschatological outlook of Matt. 24; 25 we have some very interesting data when considered in connection with the portentious signs of the times in irrepressible evidence during the years 1914-1916 A.D.

At Matt. 24:15 the Master comes to the actual time of the end and only a little beyond 1916 (how far no one knows). Then Matt. 24:21-31 records the Great Tribulation, the Second Advent and the gathering of sanctified believers from all parts of the world and their implied rapture to glory. In Matt. 24:37-51 He returns to the times immediately prior to the Great Tribulation, including 1914-1916 A. D. It is to this latter period that the THEN of Matt. 25:1 refers. “

> ***“THEN shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins which took their lamps and went forth to meet the Bridegroom; and five of them were wise and five were foolish- And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him. Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are going out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy the Bridegroom came, and they that were READY went in with HIM to the Marriage (Feast); and the door was shut. Afterwards came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us. But He answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore*** (this is specially applicable to 1916)***, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh.”***

Please note:

a. The kingdom of heaven here is not the kingdom of heaven in Matt. 19:23. The former belongs to the present age, and the latter to the age to come. The context shows this. It is just as easy for the rich as for the poor to enter the kingdom now.

b. All ten virgins were saved people-they all had oil (type of the Holy Spirit). The difference was in measure.

c. The foolish virgins are not to be identified with any of the three classes enumerated in the Parable of the Marriage of the King's Son. There we have not only utter indifference, but bitter antagonism. Not so the foolish virgins. They were really interested in the coming of the Bridegroom. But the truth of the message had not fully gripped their hearts. There is a somewhat close resemblance between them and the man without the wedding garment which typifies holiness of heart and life. Heb. 12:14; Gal. 5:19-21. **{***cf.* "**The Roman TOGA and Gal. 3:27.**"**}**

If therefore the absence of holiness, as the negative mark, and the presence of carnality as exhibited in the works of the flesh, as the positive mark, of all Christians who are to be excluded from the Marriage Feast for the King's Son, what percentage of Christians are likely to find access to the Feast, that is, to the Messianic Kingdom of the thousand years? Whether we look at the Church from the historical standpoint, or from that of personal observation, the answer, if facts are to count in our estimate, must of necessity savour of pessimism, so far as the condition of the Church is concerned. But the Master is careful to tell us the number will be very small. Matt. 7:13-14; Luke 13:24. Where can one go among the big denominations of Christendom today to hear the invitation to the Great Supper, or to the Marriage Feast for the King's Son? Or to state the matter in other words, Where can a hungry, anxious soul go to hear the Good News concerning the glory and blessedness of the Great Messianic Kingdom of the Age to Come which is the immediate goal of prophecy and hope in both Testaments?

The Jews under the O. T. believed in a literal kingdom under Messiah, and they regarded it as future. But they did not think it necessary that they should repent of sin and get right with God in order that it might come with the Advent of Messiah. The result was the rejection of the Nation and their present dispersion and sorrow.

The Church since the third century believes in a kingdom, but it is not literal and it is not future. The Christ on the Throne of the Father is now supposed to be reigning over the earth according to the requirements of both Testaments, thus confounding the Throne of God with that of David. 2 Sam. 7.

In the interpretation of our parable, therefore, let us note and remember that the Marriage Feast for the King's Son has nothing to do with the Christian's earthly life, except by way of preparation, and also that it does not belong to the present dispensation, or age, but to the age to come; and that no Christian will enter the Banqueting Hall, or share the joy and the glory, except as he has made preparation for it by a holy life. Heb. 3;4 and Heb. 12:14.

The word "***dinner***" in verse 4 [Mt. 22:4] of the parable is misleading.

The original is *ariston,* which means a light meal, similar to our luncheon, only that it was the first meal of the day. The Dinner (deipnon) came later, and usually when the day's work was done. This fact throws light on the use of the plural "Marriage-Feasts." Thayer defines *gamos,* a wedding or marriage-festival, and adds: "Under the figure of a marriage here is represented the intimate and everlasting union of Christ, AT HIS RETURN FROM HEAVEN, with His Church." Referring to Rev. 19:9, he says it is "a symbol of the future blessings of the Messiah's Kingdom," but overlooks the fact, which is the turning point of the whole matter, that the Messianic-Marriage-Festival is not for all the saved, but for the true, the faithful, the overcomers. The Holy Spirit is careful to emphasize this fact in many different ways. Thus, "***The Marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself READY***". Rev. 19:7. "***And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness*** (righteous deeds) ***of the saints.***" Could it be affirmed of the Corinthians, Galatians, or Laodiceans, that they generally were ready, and that, if brought before the judge at the Bema, they would be found clothed in fine linen clean and white? And surely no one can deny that their state spiritually was a very fair sample of the professing Church since that time.

No, the King's oxen and fatlings were not for the morning lunch, but speak of the wonderful provision God has made for the felicity of the faithful during the whole of the Messianic Period. The Eastern marriage feast usually lasted for at least one week, but this for the King's Son will last for a thousand years, when God's provision for those who have loved Him and served Him in this and previous ages will be found to surpass description, going infinitely beyond the utmost reach of the most fertile imagination of man while still in the place of preparation. 1 Cor. 2:9.

THE FALLACY OF CALVINISM.

This brings us to the discussion of the 14th verse. Who are the called? and who are the chosen? and what is their relation one to another? The assumption of the Westminster Standards, and practically all expositors is that the called are sinners who have rejected the message of the free gift of Eternal Life; and that the chosen are those who have listened to the call and have accepted the gift and that they only are saved.

Please note the following sections from Chap. III of the Confession of Faith:

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeable designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving Him there unto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.

As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted and sanctified.

Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted and saved, but the elect only.

VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.

For many years I have had a growing suspicion of the Confession of Faith, and during the last two years that suspicion has become a positive revulsion. Its faith is not that of the Son of God. It had been much more becomingly designated a “Confession of Philosophical Determinism”, with a veneer of religious pretension.

The absurdity of this thing does not lie so much in the fact that a number of men two or three centuries back should formulate a body of doctrine, so essentially anti-Christian, as that the Reformed Churches for the intervening time should profess to study the Word of God and to live in an age of progress, and yet continue to carry about their necks such a galling yoke, and not know that they were the victims of a Mediaeval delusion. The Reformed Churches received it from Calvin; and he got it from Augustine, and Augustine got it in part from heathen philosophy and in part from Roman Jurisprudence.

I give a quotation from “Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the New Testament”, by E. Hicks, D.C.L. p. 149:

> ***"Christianity traveled from the East to the West, and though for the first two centuries it was still under the influence of Greek thought and the Greek tongue, the characteristics of the Roman spirit forbade that it should for a lengthened period be ruled by the influence of Greece. The philosophy which was reflected in the theology of the East, was represented in the West by the legal genius of the Roman Empire; and it is not to be denied that a powerful stamp has been given to modern Christianity by the mould of the Roman law in which so many of its conceptions were cast. Christology is the distinctive theology of the Greek speaking Church; Soteriology that of the Latin."***

We will quote again from Arthur P. Stanley:

> ***"This fundamental contrast naturally widened into other cognate differences. The Western theology is essentially logical in form, and based on law. The Eastern is rhetorical in form and based on philosophy. The Latin divine succeeded to the Roman advocate. The Oriental divine succeeded to the Grecian sophist. Out of the logical and legal elements in the West have grown up all that is most peculiar in the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages, the Calvinistic theology of the Reformation. To one, or both of these causes of difference, may be reduced many of the divergencies which the theological student will trace in regard to dogmatic statements, or to interpretations of Scripture, between Tertullian and Origen, between Prosper and Cassian, between Augustine and Chrysostom, between Thomas Aquinas and John Damascenus."*** Eastern Church, p. 111.

What a shame that neither East nor West has a Theology based on the Bible.

In the first place the framers of the "Confession of Faith" make use of two phrases that are not found in the Bible; and moreover, are thoroughly misleading. They are "effectual calling" and "everlasting life". In the use of the former there is the false assumption that the *called* are not saved unless they are effectually *called;* and therefore the *called* are not saved.

In the latter they assume that the prize of age-enduring life has to do with the eternal state, whereas it has to do with the Messianic Kingdom for the age to come. In connection with the sections quoted above they cite about forty proof texts, and fully ninety percent of them are either misapplied or have no bearing whatever.

The teaching of our parable, as we have already stated, has a double application-to the Jew then, and to the Christian, now. In it the Master

speaks of the unfavorable reception and even the open hostility to His message of love for the professed people of God in that day; but at the same time He utters a most solemn prophecy as to a like indifference and hostility in this Church Age to the same message concerning the same but postponed Marriage Feast for the King's Son.

All through the present age, from the Apostles downward, the proclaimers of this real Gospel of the Kingdom have, as a rule, been rejected, evilly treated and often slain. The Master Himself, then Peter, James, John and Paul, all suffered martyrdom for their testimony to Kingdom Truth. Preachers of the true doctrine of the Kingdom have always been teachers of the separated life, of purity and holiness. We have only to think of The Friends of God in the twelfth century, of the Waldenses, of Spener in Germany, Madam Guyon in France; of John Wesley in England, and the Bonars in Scotland.

We must now come to the most critical part of our subject, namely, an inductive study of the two principal words in the last verse of our parable [Mt. 22:14]:

Many are CALLED but few are CHOSEN.

We will state the case again that we may see clearly the proposition before us:

The Westminster Standards assume that the *called* are not saved; that only the *chosen* are saved, and moreover, that the rest of the human race cannot be saved, but are "foreordained to everlasting death." In opposition to this I affirm that the *called* are all saved, but not necessarily sanctified subjectively; and that the *chosen* are both saved and sanctified, and will therefore have part in the first resurrection, while the former will be excluded. Rev. 20:5-6.

The Rich Young Ruler was called but not chosen, but he almost attained to the second class. I have no doubt the man found in the Banqueting Hall devoid of the wedding-garment was called, but not chosen. This is required by the trend and purpose of the parable. It is not denied, but rather assumed that he was a Jew; that is, a member of the Nation to whom "pertaineth (even now) the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises."

The wedding-garment presupposes sanctification. Compare the case of the man with the one talent. Matt. 25:24-30. See the force of "His own servants." The Man traveling into the far country is Christ Himself. Surely He does not commit the gifts of the Holy Spirit to unsaved sinners. The conclusion following from this fact is that the Kingdom Parables are not for sinners. but for the saved. Grip this fact firmly. It is evident, therefore, that if we can establish the above distinction and relativity of the two words called and chosen, the, very foundations of Calvinism are undermined and

the whole structure must tumble to pieces as a cruel and insufferable illusion, a child of darkness and sin. Our task is a simple one. The method of proof is scriptural and the logical conclusion is irresistible.

THE CALLED—*KLETOS.*

The word translated *called* is *kletos,* plural *kletoi.* It is the participle of the verb KALEO (long o). Some such noun as *guests* is understood, in the absence of which the participle becomes a noun. Thus we have the verb *kaleo,* the participle *kletos,* and the noun *klesis,* calling or vocation. We will require to examine each of these with care.

"Even us whom He hath *called,* not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." Rom. 9:24. Here the verb is evidently applied, not to the unsaved, but to the saved. There is no need to insert the word "effectually" here. To do so is only to add an element of confusion and discord. So far as the first degree of salvation is concerned the idea of effectuality is already latent in the verb as one of its constituent elements, just as heat is implied in the idea of fire.

"But when it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb, and *called* me His grace." Gal. 1:15. Was that an effectual call or was it not? What is the use of adding superfluous words to Holy Writ except it be to lend plausibility to an unscriptural theory?

"By faith Abraham, when he was *called* to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed." Heb. 11:8. This call was not a mere expression of desire on Jehovah's part; but a work of power which forever separated the Father of the Faithful from the land of his nativity and made him the true servant of the living God. These three citations ought to be enough. Listen to Thayer:

"Everywhere in the N. T. only those are spoken of as *called* by God who have listened to His voice addressed to them in the Gospel, hence those who have enlisted in the service of Christ." Let that suffice for the verb.

THE PARTICIPLE—KLETOS.

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, *called* to be an Apostle" Rom. 1:1. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are *called* according to His purpose." Rom. 8:28.

"For we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are *called,* both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." I Cor. 1:23. So in all other places where the participle occurs. It is never once applied to the unsaved, and it is invariably effectual.

THE NOUN—KLESIS.

"The gifts and *calling* of God are without repentance." Rom. 11:29. "*Called* (aorist participle) with an holy *calling* (noun)". 2 Tim. 1:9. "That our God would count you worthy of this *calling".* 2 Thess. 1:11. Thus we see that all three words-are used exclusively in reference to believers. There are passages where the participle, followed by a genitive of the person as possessor, carries with it more than is implied in justification and the new birth, and makes *kletos* virtually equivalent to *ekletktos.* As "Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ (*kletoi Iesou Christou*). Rom. 1:6. See Thayer. Compare Gal. 5:24. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts". This can only be affirmed of Christians in whom the claims of Christ are supreme above those of self and the world. All such have on the wedding garment long before they go in to the Banqueting Hall.

Now if the verb, the participle, and the noun, be all applied exclusively to believers, what becomes of the Mediaeval theory of the Confession of Faith which affirms that all the *called* are eternally lost, and only the elect are saved? This is Calvinism. How simple and conclusive is the exposure of the fallacy, and yet this hideous product of heathen philosophy and Roman Law has, in the name of Christianity, held millions of God's people in the galling fetters of a bondage almost as cruel as that of Roman Catholicism, and perhaps quite as offensive to the Great Head of the Church. And yet it is only a few years since Dr. B. B. Warfield delighted the conservative element of the New York Presbytery with a most eloquent eulogy of this anomalous survival of a semi-barbaric age. Read the quotation from Froude's Essays at the beginning of a previous chapter.

But we are not yet done with this little family of words, each in itself a torch and all three a living flame of holy fire.

I have pointed out the fact that whether the verb, the participle, or the noun be employed the implication is always present that the call is effectual. This cannot be denied.

Let us now note the fact that these three words have a twofold use in the N. T. First, when the sinner is called out of the old creation and into the new. This has been the prominent thought in the passages already cited. This call, being in its nature effectual, issues in the new birth and justification. The man so called is saved in the first degree. They are employed, second, when the Holy Spirit would lead men, already saved in the first degree, on to maturity and thus prepare them for entrance into the Messianic Kingdom, which fact is symbolized and parabolized in the teaching of the Great Supper (Luke 14:12-24); and also in the Marriage-Feast for the King's Son. This distinction is of the most vital importance if we are to have sound exegesis and make logical deductions. Just a few examples:

"***The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a certain King which made a Marriage for His Son. And sent forth His servants to call them that had been Called to the wedding; and they would not come.***" Matt. 22:2-3.

Thus our first illustration is from the very parable we are studying. The Jews were looked upon and treated as a people in covenant with God. As already pointed out they had, as a Nation, been called by Moses and Aaron and accepted by God at Sinai as His people. How plain is the fact that the parable could have no possible application to the people of Greece, or Rome, or any other Gentile nation. They had not been called. But Israel had. "***You only have I known of all the families of the earth***" Amos 3:2. And just as the parable had no application to sinners in that Jewish Age; neither has it any application to them in the present Christian Age. And to so apply it is to miss entirely the vital point in the Master's teaching. And yet this is just the thing that is everywhere done and the traditions of men substituted for the word of God. I will give some samples of this perversion of God's word as presented in our parable from the writings of men considered thoroughly evangelical.

"God makes every possible effort, with tireless patience, to bring men to the Gospel." "These preparatory foretastes of the great supper which the Church now enjoys." "Only when Christ was crucified on Calvary were all things fully ready."

"Their abrupt refusal at the eleventh hour, after all was ready to receive them, partook of the nature both of breach of engagement and disloyalty."

"None of the excuses that men make are of any value. There is not one they will dare to offer in the judgment day".

"It is very strange that any wish to be excused. Excused from what? From God, from heaven, from glory, from happiness, from immortality, from the noblest life possible to man".

In every one of the above quotations, which are truly representative of the best orthodox teaching of the Church for centuries, the writers invariably apply the instruction of the Master to sinners, and characterize their conduct in refusing the offer of salvation as inexcusable folly. But as a matter of fact, deduced by sound exegesis, the sinner is not within the whole horizon of the Saviour of men as He gives forth the momentous truth of the parable. True, indeed, the Jews were sinners, but their sin consisted essentially in their rejection of the Messianic claims of the Son of Man. John 1:11-12, 41, 49; 5:39-43. And the sin of the Jew is the sin of the Christian. He will not accept Kingdom Truth. The first quotation given above should read thus:

"God makes every possible effort, with tireless patience, to bring BELIEVERS into the Messianic Kingdom, but THEY WILL NOT COME."

Besides, it is not true that when Christ was crucified on Calvary "all things were fully ready." **{**Matthew 22:4; Luke 14:17**}** The Jewish Nation had by that time been set aside. Matt. 23:37-39, and a new dispensation, or age, was about to be inaugurated, and God had yet to "visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His Name." Acts 15:14-16. The invitation can be given and accepted now, but the Marriage-Feast cannot take place till the fulness of the Gentiles has come in the consummation of Daniel's Seventieth Week. Luke 21:24. Then according to the parable it is not sinners, but Christians who are asking to be "excused from glory, from happiness, from immortality, and from the noblest life possible to man". The Great Salvation of which Paul speaks in Heb. 2:1-3 is the Messianic Kingdom. The majority of Christians come under the description given in Heb. 6:4-8; and 1 Cor. 10:1-10 We will take another example of this use of the verb *kaleo.*

"***For the Kingdom of Heaven is as a Man traveling into a far country, who called His own servants, and delivered unto them His goods.***" Matt. 25:14. This parable of the talents is specially for this Church Age. Those who received the talents were "His own servants" before He, Christ, *called* them into service. This call was based on a previous call whereby they became "His". Two out of the three succeed in the service of the, Master, and when "after a long time" He comes they will go into the Marriage; but the third fails in service, and he, though a servant, a saved man, is cast into outer darkness. Herein lies the grip of the parable. 1 Cor. 6:9.

An excellent illustration of this use of the verb is found in Rom. 8:30. There is no reference to sinners here. It is the second call. We find the participle employed in this higher spiritual sense in Rom. 8:28: "**We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are *called* according to His purpose.**" This call is to the Marriage of the King's Son, and it is effectual. Compare 1 Cor. 1:24; and Jude 1. It is not true that all things work together for good to Christians who love the world. Rom. 1:18; 2:1-9; Jas. 4:4.

The use of the noun with reference to the coming Messianic Kingdom may be found in the following passages:

"That ye may know what is the hope of His *calling* (klesis). Eph. 1:18. Walk worthy of your *vocation* (klesis). Eph. 4:1,4.

"For the prize of the high *calling* ". Phil. 3:14.

We have the two calls in verse three: "He sent forth His servants to *call* them who had (at a certain time previous) been called, to the wedding." Why did the Revisers, both A.V. and R.V., translate the first verb by *call* and in the second by *bidden?* In the former the verb is in the infinitive present, and in the latter it is the perfect participle, thus indicating that the first call had preceded the second by some time. In this respect the parable is based on the social customs of the Jews. Kitto says, "It is still customary

in the East not only to give an invitation some time before hand but to send round servants at the proper time to inform the invited guests that all things are ready".

The whole Jewish Nation had been called through Moses and Aaron; and at Sinai God, Jehovah, formally and openly took the Nation to be His own in a peculiar sense, and from that day till the rejection of the Christ they were so regarded. Yes, and even now they are His, though for a time cast off. The time of their restoration is almost at hand. Jer. 31:1-40.

In the eighth verse of the parable we read concerning the King: "Then saith He to His servants, "The wedding is ready, but they which were *called* were not worthy". In the first call out of Egypt the action of God in their deliverance took no note of personal worth, or lack of it. The reason of this was two fold. In the first place, personal or collective worth was out of the question owing to the fact that the covenant people were in bondage and had no teachers; and in the second place, because the theocratic kingdom as then set up at Sinai was only a type, a shadow of good things to come. But with the appearance of Christ, Israel's true King, the time had arrived for the substance to displace the shadow; and owing to the fuller revelation given to the nation through Moses and the prophets they had abundance of time and opportunity to prepare for the second call when the Messiah should appear on the scene in the fulness of time. But at no time during the Mosaic Age could the invitation to the Marriage Feast for the King's Son have been given to the people of Israel. There were many feasts in that age but they were all typical of the better things to come in the Messianic Age. This is the uniform message of all the Patriarchs and Prophets. And since the King was rejected, the Kingdom postponed and Israel's King withdrawn from earth to heaven, it follows that at no time since then could the people of God either during life or at death go in to the Marriage Supper. The second invitation could be given and accepted, but there can be no actual going in to the Marriage-Feast until the Son comes in the glory of the Father and of the holy angels, having received the Kingdom. Luke 9:26; 19:11-15. Then all believers will be brought before the Bema (2 Cor. 5:10), and there be divided into two classes -the spiritual and the carnal; the just and the unjust; the holy and the unholy. The first class will receive their glorified bodies and will go in to the Marriage, for they are "ready". Rev. 19:7. But the second class will be found naked (without resurrection bodies), and they will be ashamed away from the presence of the King and His Bride. 1 John 2:28; Matt. 25:1-13, 30; Gal. 5:19-21; Heb. 12:14. But this does not alter the fact that they are in possession of the gift of eternal life. Their loss, however, is inexpressibly great. This is the teaching of our parable in its application to the present age of grace, and to the Lord's people.

When a sinner comes to Christ for salvation (in the first degree, the new birth and justification) there is no more room for personal worth than in the case of the typical Israelite when called out of his bondage and ignorance as a slave of Pharoah, the embodiment of the world spirit. But as soon as the first call comes there is, as with Israel at Sinai, a second call to "the obedience of faith", a holy walk, a real death to the world, the flesh and the Devil; and all this in order to prepare for a place in the coming Messianic Kingdom to be established at the second advent of Christ. It is here that the secondary use of the verb kaleo and its derivatives comes into action. When once the reader gets a firm grip on this great fact it will seem to him almost incredible that the Prince of the power of the air should have blinded the eyes of God's people, and especially of its teachers and leaders, to a truth of such vital and fundamental importance. Yet so far as my studies have gone I can find no trace of it subsequent to the Apostolic Age. But the Bible from Genesis to Revelation is full of it. Once the clue is really found you encounter it everywhere. The psychical mind stands in the way. 1 Cor. 2:14; Rom. 8:7.

It is also a fact well worth noting that secular, philosophical, and even theological education, speaking academically, have no tendency to work in the way of freedom from either the psychical or carnal mind, but rather to deepen and intensify the bondage until the victim becomes hopelessly insensible to the appeals and promptings of the Spirit of Truth and Righteousness, and finally dies in a state of condemnation. The successful seeker after truth must, while not despising educational institutions and methods, find intellectual and spiritual emancipation in the School of Christ or not at all. Luke 14:25-35; Luke 9:23; Psalm 23.

The above considerations are calculated to prepare us for an examination of the essential significance of the second definitive term in the last verse of our parable the word chosen. As a matter of fact the whole force of the parable is summed up and crystallized in this one verse. Every word contributes its quota to the solemn and almost startling conclusion: The "**many"** and the "**few**;" the "**for**" and the "**but**;" the "**called**" and the "**chosen**." [Matt. 22:14]

CHOSEN—EKLEKTOI.

Here again we have another family group of three words: The verb-*eklego;* the participle-*eklektos*; and the noun-*ekloge* (long e). These words are translated Into English in both the A.V. and R.V., by *choose, chosen, elect,* or *election.*

The Confession of Faith and Reformed Theology generally assume and even affirm that only the *elect* are saved and the *called* are all lost. We have already demonstrated that the *called* are all saved. What then is the

difference in the two words, for they cannot be synonymous. The adversative “but” indicates not only difference but antithesis. The solution is very simple. We have only to follow the Inductive Method steadfastly and conscientiously to reach the truth. Very slight knowledge of the original is requisite.

The *called* in its primary and most comprehensive sense is the sum total of the saved. And the *chosen* are a small company called (secondary sense) out of the sum total of the saved, for special service and honor. It is also evident on the very surface of the parable that the second call, which issues in the election of the few, is not the result of any arbitrary decision of the sovereignty of the Divine Will irrespective of the freedom of the will of man, for the second call was given to all who had the first call, but the majority “would not come”. Let us proceed:

The verb (eklego) occurs in the N. T. only in the passive and middle forms. We will first hear what Thayer has to say. He renders it, *to pick out, to choose; to pick or choose out for one’s self;* and cites Luke 10:42; 14:7; “One out of many”, (of Jesus choosing His disciples). John 6:70. Then he adds:

“Especially is God said to choose those whom He had judged fit to receive His favors and separated from the rest of mankind to be peculiarly His own and to be attended continually by His gracious oversight: thus of the Israelites, Acts 13:17 (Deut. 14:2;4:37)”.

Surely that is conclusive as to the real meaning of the word. But it is one thing to define a word and quite another to abide by that meaning in the construction of thought; and therefore we must scrutinize the following part of the quotation with suspicion. He adds:

“Of Christians, as those whom He has set apart from the irreligious multitude as dear unto Himself, and whom He has rendered, through faith in Christ, citizens in the Messianic Kingdom. Mark 13:20”.

This sentence needs interpreting, and in doing so we find that he has utterly abandoned his definition and given a comprehension to the verb which, while upholding tradition, nullifies the Scriptures of truth. The definition limits the act of choosing to a few Christians out of many Christians. But in exposition he makes the few Christians to include all Christians. Here is the “little leaven which leavens the whole lump”. According to Scripture usage the verb eklego in its application to believers indicates the choice of a few out of the many, or all, of the same class-Christians. This verb always presupposes the one which precedes it in the verse we are dealing with (kaleo and its derivatives). Matt. 22:14.

Thayer’s error may be illustrated thus: Some men are colored; Americans are men; therefore Americans are colored. We will now turn to the Scriptures and note how the Holy Spirit employs the verb:

"And when it was day He called unto Him His disciples; and of them He *chose* twelve." Luke 6:13.

"Mary hath *chosen* that good part". Luke 10:42.

"They *chose* out the chief rooms". Luke 14:7.

"They *chose* Stephen, a man full of the Holy Ghost." Acts 6:5.

"It seemed good unto us to send *chosen* men unto you." Acts 15:25.

Thus the verb is invariably used where there is the choice of a few out of many of the same class.

THE PARTICIPLE—EKLEKTOS.

In his definition and application of the participle, Thayer is even more confused than in his treatment of the verb. He proceeds thus: *picked out, chosen; chosen of God to obtain salvation through Christ.* But here we have a right to ask, What salvation? To this question he has no answer. Is it salvation in the first, or second degree? Is it the salvation implied in *kaleo* or in *eklekto?* He carelessly assumes it to be the former when in reality it is the latter. Then he adds, "hence Christians are called the chosen or elect of God". Again we enquire, What Christians? All, or some? He takes it for granted, contrary to the specific statement of the Master, that it is the former while it is clearly the latter. I quote again:

"Eklektoi, those who have become true partakers of the Christian salvation are contrasted with kletoi, those who have been invited but who have not shown themselves fitted to obtain it."

But what is the true salvation? To this he has no answer, nor have the expositors. One may consult any lexicon he can lay his hands on and there is nothing but confusion and exegetical inconsistency wherever you turn. And the confusion arises from the fact that they do not see one of the most transparent truths in the Bible; namely, the dualistic character of salvation as involved in the two verbs *kaleo* and *eklego.* In his definition of *kaleo* he says, "only those are spoken of as *called* by God who have listened to His voice addressed to them in the Gospel", but in the quotation given above he says, "the kletoi are those who have been invited to become partakers of the Christian salvation but who have not shown themselves fitted to obtain it." What could be more utterly foreign to the inductive method, and to good common sense than that kind of reasoning? And there is absolutely no way out of the tangle apart from the line of interpretation presented in the pages of this book. But to do this is to consign post-millennialism and Calvinism to the Abyss whence they came. Better now than later.

We will now quote a few passages which exhibit the Scriptural use of the participle: "Many are (effectually) called, but few are *chosen".* Matt. 22:14.

"And they that are with Him are called (in secondary sense), and *chosen* and faithful". -Rev. 17:14.

"To whom coming as unto a living stone-*chosen* of God and precious." 1 Pet. 2:4. Here again we see that it is a few out of many of the same class.

But it is when we examine the passages where the participle (eklektos) is rendered into English by the term "elect" that the fundamental fallacy of Calvinism comes clearly into view. Let the reader keep in mind the basic assumption of Calvinism, that only the elect are saved, and we will proceed with our argument.

"And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the *elect's* sake those days shall be shortened". Matt. 24:22.

"And shall deceive the very *elect".* Matt. 24:24.

"And they (the angels) shall gather together His *elect* from the four winds of heaven". Matt. 24:31.

"Shall not God avenge His own *elect?"* Luke 18:7.

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's *elect?"* Rom. 8:33. "All things are for the *elect's* sakes". 2 Tim. 2:10.

It is surely unnecessary to cite any more passages. The universal assumption of the lexicons, expositors, and theologians, is that the above Scriptures apply to all Christians. But the solemn truth of the matter is that they are predicable of only a very few Christians. The days of the great tribulation will not be shortened for the sake of all Christians then living on the earth; but for the sake of the few, those who have loved the Saviour above all else and have been true to Him in their life and testimony. They are the Christians who have faith in God when the great mass of believers are drifting with the world, and are the victims of its ambition, its lust, and its hopeless delusion. And no sane man can deny that while the relation of the Church to the world, as presented in the Scriptures, is one of contrast and even antagonism, the line of demarcation today is practically obliterated and therefore the professing Church must share with the world the now impending wrath. The appeal of the Master is now to the individual only. Rev. 3:20-21. Indeed, the professing Church will be one of the agencies that will by its sins call down the wrath of God upon the world, of which it has become a part. Compare Amos 3:2 and 1 Pet. 4:17-18.

THE NOUN—EKLOGE.

Thayer defines it thus: election, choice, the act of picking out, choosing.

We will note just a few examples to prove the unity of thought and purpose running through this little family of words:

"He is a *chosen* vessel (lit. a vessel of *election)* unto Me". Acts 9:15. "The purpose of God according to *election".* Rom. 9:11.

"According to the *election* of grace". Rom. 11:5.

"The *election* hath obtained it". Rom. 11:7.

"As touching the *election".* Rom. 11:28.

"Knowing, brethren beloved, your *election* of God". 1 Thess. 1:4.

"Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and *election* sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall". 2 Pet. 1:10.

The one essential point to be carefully observed in all three words (the verb, participle, and noun) is that they speak of a few Christians selected for a purpose out of the great mass of Christians, and that, too, on the ground of personal fidelity to truth and righteousness and God. In other words, the unholy, I might almost say blasphemous, thought, or dogma, of the sovereign election of a few out of the great mass of sinners to eternal life, and that all the rest are cast off and delivered to be eternally damned, is utterly foreign to the Scriptures, and an inexcusable slander on the character of God. The open infidelity of all the Ingersolls, Voltaires and Paines the world has hitherto produced have not done half the damage to Christianity that has been done by this infidel dogma which lies at the very basis of Calvinism. In His Word Studies Dr. Vincent makes the following comment on 1 Thess. 1:4:

> ***"This, and the kindred words, eklegein, to choose, and eklektos, chosen or elect, are used of God's selection of men or agencies for special missions or attainments; but neither here nor elsewhere in the N. T. is there any warrant for the revolting doctrine that God has predestined a definite number of mankind to eternal life, and the rest to eternal destruction."***

To this I say, Amen. But in the next two sentences of the same paragraph the good Doctor falls into error and virtually contradicts, in part, the truth of the above quotation.

He says:

> ***"The sense of this passage seems to be defined by the succeeding context. The Thessalonians had been chosen to be members of the Christian Church, and their conduct had justified the choice".***

But we have already proven that all the *called* are saved and therefore are members of the Christian Church. It is the same old error, hoary with age, the failure to see the dualism of salvation, first from the guilt of sin and second from its power and the bearing of these on human destiny. The truth of the matter is that the Thessalonians, because of their fidelity to the saving truths of the word, and especially the truth of the Lord's pre-millennial coming to establish the Messianic Kingdom, had proven themselves worthy of a place in the first resurrection and in the consequent glory of that Kingdom, to which, on the ground of their fidelity,

God had elected them. But the Corinthians as a body had given themselves up to carnality, and the Galatians had fallen into legalism, and so they are not only not among the *elect* but are exposed to coming judgment. 1 Cor. 3:1-15; and Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Cor. 6:5-10. It is the privilege of every man who has had the first call out of the world to know that he is saved, regenerated, justified. Being assured of this it is his further privilege to listen to and accept the second call to the Marriage of the King's Son and by faith, by cleansing through the word and growth in grace, to get himself ready for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. But such ,preparation is impossible except by the knowledge of dispensational and prophetic truth. The second call was silenced, so far as corporate testimony was concerned, about the end of the third century. Since then the professing Church has been its most deadly enemy. But nearly one hundred years ago the Holy Spirit began to revive that testimony through the instrumentality of certain individual men, and today it is believed by tens of thousands. But it is useless to expect that the Church, in its corporate capacity, will ever again place the seal of its approval on this glorious truth so dear to the hearts of Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles; yea, and above all, to the heart of the Christ of God.

In the meantime let every lover of truth and righteousness give attention to the words of Peter:

> ***"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the Day Star arise in your hearts"***. 2 Pet. 1:19.

He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all.

Amen.

APPENDIX.

There is really no problem before the world today, whether it pertain to matters of a constructive or destructive character, which does not find its solution, at the last analysis, in its relation of affinity or antagonism to the Christ of God, the Man of Nazareth and the Son of Mary–the God-man. The great world-war now being waged has its roots in religion, or rather in irreligion, and back of that in the fundamentally determining principles of Theology. To listen to some of the speeches and watch the actions of the preachers and theologians of today, especially in the nations more immediately involved in the struggle, one might think that the only

principles to be considered were those which fall within the political, economic and commercial horizon. But as a matter of fact all economic and commercial considerations are conditioned by the principles of ethics, and at a lower depth these are in turn determined by the principles of theology.

And the central fact in theology is the Person of Jesus Christ and His relation to God on the one hand and to man and the world on the other. The antagonistic attitude of the nations to the Christ explains everything; and for this attitude the religious and theological leaders of the people are most responsible. This being so it follows of necessity that before the world moves, or is moved, out of the present chaos and into a place of rest and peace, the conflict must take on a religious character, and there must come a time of persecution for the true people of God which will work the same havoc in the Church which is now being wrought in the State. Neither the Church nor the State have been willing for eighteen hundred years to give the Christ His rightful place. And more than that they never will until they do so under the compulsion of theocratic necessity. Psalms 2; 110. In reference to the claims of the Son of Man I wish to make a somewhat lengthy quotation from "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," by Dr. A. M. Fairbairn. He is speaking of the work done by historical criticism to recover for the Church the true conception of the Christ:

> ***"Now, the historical spirit could not do its now destructive and now constructive work and ignore the Supreme Person of history. He has left the mark of His hand on every generation of civilized men that has lived since He lived, and it would not be science to find Him everywhere and never to ask what He was and what He did. Persons are the most potent factors of progress and change in history, and the greatest Person known to it is the One who has been the most powerful factor of ordered progress. Who this is does not lie open to dispute. Jesus Christ is a name that represents the most wonderful story and the profoundest problem on the field of history-the one because the other. There is no romance so marvellous as the most prosaic version of His history. The Son of a despised and hated people, meanly born, humbly bred, without letters, without opportunity, unbefriended, never save for one brief and fatal moment the idol of the crowd, opposed by the rich, resisted by the religious and the learned, persecuted unto death by the priests, destined to a life as short as it was obscure, issuing from His obscurity only to meet a death of unpitied infamy, He yet, by means of His very sufferings and His cross, enters upon a throne such as no monarch ever filled and a dominion such as no Caesar ever exercised. He leads captive the civilized peoples; they accept His words as***

law, though they confess it a law higher than human nature likes to obey; they build Him churches, they worship Him, they praise Him in songs, interpret Him in philosophies and theologies; they deeply love, they madly hate, for His sake. It was a new thing in the history of the world; for though this humble life was written and stood vivid before the eye and imagination of men, nay, because it veritably did so stand, they honoured, loved, served Him as no ancient deity had been honoured, loved, or served. We may say, indeed, He was the first being who had realized for man the idea of the Divine; He proved His Godhead by making God become a credibly, conceived, believed, real Being to man. And all this was due to no temporary passion, to no transient madness, such as now and then overtakes peoples as well as persons. It has been the most permanent thing in the history of mind; no other belief has had so continuous and invariable a history. The gods of Greece lived an even more changeful life than the Greek men; the Zeus of Homer and of Plato, though one in name, is in character not only two, but two radical opposites. The history of religion in India is but a record of the variations and the multiplication of deities. The mythologies of Mesopotamia and Egypt were never fixed; they bewilder by the number and extent of the changes in the crowd of figures they present for analysis. But the belief in Christ has for now almost two thousand years lived under a criticism the most searching and scientific that ever assailed any idea of mind or fact of history, and yet this criticism has only made the belief more active, more vigorous, more sure of its intrinsic truth and reasonableness. What makes the result more wonderful is, that the criticism was at its thoroughest when the faith seemed at its weakest. In the first centuries of its existence, when it had to suffer from the reproach of its recent and mean origin, the infamy of its Founder's death, the poverty and ignorance of its adherents, and its varied offences against Greek culture and Roman policy, — it had to bear the malignant yet searching criticism of Celsus, the witty satire of Lucian, the vindictive and insolent invective of the rhetors and their schools. Yet the men of the new religion were, even within the arena of letters, victorious over the men of the old learning. And both in the last century and in this, when it seemed weak through continued supremacy, the exercise of a too secular lordship, and the reproach of lives which it nominally guided but did

> ***not really command, it received but renewal at the hands of the subtle scepticism of Hume and the destructive criticism of Strauss. The wonderful thing in the story is, that what in the abstract would have seemed impossible romance is in reality the most sober fact; while out of the story, when viewed in relation to the course of human development, rises for philosophy the problem, Can He, so mean in life, so illustrious in history, stand where He does by chance? Can He, who of all persons is the most necessary to the orderly and progressive course of history, be but the fortuitous result of a chapter of accidents?"*** pp. 6, 7, 8.

It will be conceded by the majority of those who take an interest in theological problems that within the bounds of the British Empire the now passing generation has produced no theologian to surpass Dr. Fairbairn in vigor of thought, in comprehensiveness of outlook and in moral earnestness. But as a matter of fact neither in his hands, nor in the hands of any of the men of his generation, has the Historical Method accomplished the task which by its own free choice it has set itself. It has not recovered the Christ of the four Gospels. The proof of this charge is by no means difficult.

No sensible Bible student can deny that the Christ of the New Testament is the Messiah of the Old Testament. The A.V. and R.V. have to a great extent concealed this fact by their wicked suppression of the Greek article, which in the Gospels generally precedes the word "Christ." Peter said to the Master, "**Thou art the Christ.**" Here the Revisers are good enough to insert the article, but why not do the same every place it occurs? The Prophets of Judah and Israel could not for a moment contemplate the Messiah (the anointed One) without thinking of Him as the coming King of Israel and of the Gentile nations. And in the days of primitive Christianity the disciples of the risen Lord could not read the words "the Christ" without the same thought of the Theocratic rule of the Son of Man on earth and in the heavens during the period of Israel's Golden Age as pictured and featured by Patriarchs and Prophets from the days of Abraham and onwards.

What I want to affirm is that the teachers and pupils of the so-called Historical School have done absolutely nothing to recover this conception of the Christ; but on the contrary have done all in their power to keep it out of their theology, out of their Christology and Soteriology. It is both amusing and pathetic to witness the perplexity of one of Scotland's most dignified and celebrated theologians, and belonging to the same school as Dr. Fairbairn, as he puzzles his brain in a fruitless effort to discover the personality of the King referred to in the Second Psalm, whom Jehovah is soon to set upon "***His Holy Hill of Zion.***" There are two things which are

supremely characteristic of the men of this school, namely, the extraordinary fund of knowledge which they possess concerning the technicalities, conventionalities and absurdities of the Higher Criticism; and at the same time their profound ignorance of some of the elementary truths of Christianity. This recalls the pertinency for the present day of some touching and trenchant words spoken by the Master nineteen hundred years ago:

> ***"I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."*** Luke 10:21.

It may be stated as an inflexible postulate of sound exegesis, that any interpretation of the Bible which denies to Israel the comfort and inspiration of its Messianic Hope; and thereby denies to Jesus Christ as the Son of David and the Son of Abraham His right and place and glory as the primal heir of the Davidic and Abrahamic Covenants; and thus shuts Him out from that which was dearest to His heart as a Man, and for which He became incarnate; namely, that He might regain as Federal Head of the New Creation, all and more than was lost by the first man in intellectual dignity, moral worth and terrestrial sovereignty, is wholly alien to the truth of revelation, antagonistic to the Holy Spirit and subversive of the Divine Plan of the Ages, and at the same time extensively contributory to the out-working of the mystery of iniquity; and is therefore to be set aside as utterly destitute of Divine sanction and to be shunned by every true child of God. In short, *postmillennialism*, the so-called *historical method* and the *higher criticism*, are simply so many ways of expressing the same thought and tendency and purpose–the universal conspiracy to keep the Christ of God from the sovereignty of this world. Men seldom know the real nature of the thoughts and theories they cherish in opposition to the will of God and the claims of His Christ; but the prince of this world who inspired them does. Man's ignorance of the real nature of dynamite does not in the least affect its destructive power. So with Antichristianism in all its phases.

The number of theologians in our modern educational institutions who can see the real truth concerning The Christ of the N.T. and the Messiah in the O. T., can be counted on the fingers, while it is clearly apprehended by thousands and tens of thousands of people in the humbler walks of life.

From a literary and artistic standpoint the above quotation from Dr. Fairbairn is beautiful and full of tender pathos; but from a logical and theological and historical point of view it is characterized by a large amount of subtle error. For example, he dwells much and eloquently on the idea of "development." But as a matter of fact the only development this age knows, or can know, is that which in moral character modern nations have in common with ancient Babylon, Greece and Rome. Morally and

spiritually the last fifty years have been characterized by retrogression and apostasy, and the proof of this indictment is found in the present condition of the nations of Christendom. And the process of devolution is yet a long way from its destined goal. And in working out that destiny we may be sure that modern theology, while remaining Christian in name, will operate hand in hand with modern politics, commerce and militarism. Dr. Fairbairn says as quoted:

He (Christ) yet, by means of His very sufferings and His cross, enters upon a throne such as no monarch ever filled and a dominion such as no Caesar ever exercised."

That is nothing more or less than pure sentimentality. The fact is that this very dominion is exercised by the greatest and most relentless enemy of the Christ. Either this or the Bible is not true, and the present World-War is simply a fantastic illusion, the imagination of soldiers, politicians and diplomatists. I John 5:19.

In further proof of what I have said about the inability of modern theologians to recover the historical Christ, I wish to quote from another of the foremost leaders of religious opinion in England during the last century. I refer to Dr. J. B. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham. It is doubtful if there is anything in print on the Fourth Gospel which is more to the point than the following quotation when taken just as it stands and interpreted according to its plain grammatical sense:

> ***"The narrative and the discourses alike are thoroughly saturated with the Messianic ideas of the time. The Christ as expected by the Jews, is the one central figure round which all the facts are grouped, the one main topic on which all the conversations hinge. This is the more remarkable, because the leading conception in the writer's own mind is not the Messiah, but the Word, the Logos, not the deliverance of Israel, but the manifestation of God in the flesh. This main purpose is flung out at the opening of the Gospel, and is kept steadily in view in the selection of materials throughout the work. But it does not once enter into the mind of the Jews, who are wholly absorbed in the Messianic idea. Nay, the word Logos does not once occur even on our Lord's own lips, though the obvious motive of His teaching is to enforce this higher aspect of His person, to which they were strangers. And I cannot but think that this distinct separation is a remarkable testimony to the credibility of the writer, who, however strongly impressed with his mission as the teacher of a great theological conception, nevertheless keeps it free from his narrative of facts, though obviously there would be a***

very strong temptation to introduce it, a temptation which to the mere forger would be irresistible.
The Messianic idea, for instance, is turned about on all sides, and presented in every aspect. On this point we learn very much more of contemporary Jewish opinion from the Fourth Gospel than from the other three. At the commencement and at the close of the narrative-in the preaching of the Baptist and the incidents of the Passion-it is equally prominent. In Galilee (John 1:41, 46, 49; 6:15, 28, 30 sq.), in Samaria (John 4:25, 29, 42), in Judea John 5:39, 45 sq.; John 7:26, 40-43; 8:30; 10:24), it is the one standard theme of conversation. Among friends, among foes, among neutrals alike it is mooted and discussed. The person and character of Jesus are tried by this standard. He is accepted or He is rejected as He fulfils or contradicts the received ideal of the Messiah." Biblical Essays, pages 23, 24.

I repeat that nothing could be more delightful than that. Just as it stands there is evidence of penetrating insight, subtle and exhaustive, analysis, and a mental grasp which, so far as the letter is concerned, leaves nothing to be desired. As a word picture it is simply exquisite. Now watch the famous Churchman as he steps back from his canvas and pelts the beautiful picture with the mud of traditionalism, rationalism, and postmillennialism.

"The topic of our Lord's discourse with the Jews is not the Logos, for which his auditors would feel neither predilection nor interest, but the Messianic expectation, in which they were thoroughly absorbed. It was shown that the Messianic conceptions are not the ideas as corrected by the facts, but the ideas in their original form, not yet spiritualized, but coarse and materialistic still, reflecting the sentiments, not of the second century, but of the early years of the first; in a word, Jewish, not Christian." page 145. Alas! how are the mighty fallen! According to this we are not to interpret the former quotation in the light of its plain grammatical sense. On the contrary we are to look at it through the bespattered lenses of second century philosophical theology. In other words, John and Peter and James who shared the common Messianic expectations of the Jews generally, made a great mistake when they dreamed of a literal fulfilment of the promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and cherished "politico-theocratic hopes"; and that even the great apostle of the Gentiles who about the year A. D. 60, when standing before King Agrippa and the Jewish Hierarchy declared, "***And now I stand and am judged for the (literal) hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers*** (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) ***; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and***

night, hope to come (in the Messianic Millennial Kingdom)***: for which hope's sake King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews,***" was also the insensible victim of a cruel delusion. Poor Paul and Peter and James and John, how they are to be pitied for their stupidity when looked at in the light of modern rationalism and also in the light of the apostatizing Church of the second century.

Note specially the following words in the last quotation.

> ***"It was shown that the Messianic conceptions are not the ideas AS CORRECTED BY THE FACTS, but the ideas in their original form, NOT YET SPIRITUALIZED, but coarse and materialistic still, reflecting the sentiments not of the second century, but of the early years of the first; in a word, Jewish, not Christian."***

Is not that the very essence of post-millennial rationalism. What a suicidal and revolutionary inversion of the inflexible order of God's ordaining when we are invited to look, ethically and theologically, at the utterances of inspired men in the first century and interpret them in the light of the truth as known or not known in the second century, when as Dean Stanley says, that the Church had become, or was becoming, a part of the political systems of the world. This is the curse of theology-reading and studying the Bible in the light of historical theology as exhibited in the successive centuries of "this wicked and adulterous generation." Think of the absurdity of it-"The ideas as corrected by the facts." The "facts" he refers to here are not facts at all but the absurd fictions of such men as Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen.

The plain fact of the matter is that the Lord Jesus Christ in all His teaching up to a certain point encouraged the Jews in what the orthodox theologians designate with contempt as "coarse and materialistic" hopes, for in no other way can the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants ever be realized. God Almighty gave the promise of the Land and the Kingdom to Abraham and David in the most literal sense and in the face of the anticipated unbelief of this Church Age, and confirmed it with an oath. Gen. 22:11-19; 15:5-7; Heb. 6:11-20; 11:13, 39-40.

It was only when the Jewish Hierarchy attributed the miracles of Jesus to the Devil, and thus rejected the Christ as their Messiah and true King, that the offer of the literal Kingdom was withdrawn, and for the time being postponed. But that very Kingdom shall yet be established in awful majesty and irresistible power. Acts 15:14-18, and Amos 9:11-15. We must not confound postponement with abolition.

Which is the more productive of evil? To give out falsehood which is openly antagonistic to the truth of the Bible; or, under the profession of loyalty to truth as revealed in the Word, to fully accept the great doctrines of the

Bible and then so interpret and construe them as to pervert their meaning and falsify their purpose? What will be, in the Day of judgment, the penalty pronounced on those who are responsible for the fabrication and perpetuation of this deadly spiritualizing process of postmillennialism whereby the traditions of men are substituted for the living truths of God's Word? Surely this is holding down the truth in unrighteousness, Rom. 1:18.

The following are some of the grounds on which believers will be excluded from the Messianic Kingdom during the Age to Come:

An unforgiving spirit. Matt. 18:35.

Clinging to the world and its principles. Luke 18:18-30.

Inhumanity. Luke 16:19-31.

Not going on to perfection. Heb. 8:1-18.

The works of the flesh. Gal. 5:19-21.

Putting stumbling blocks in the way of God's little ones. Mark 9:38.

Professing the truth and not practicing it. John 13:17.

Cherishing a spirit of discord and division in the Church. Gal. 5:19-21.

Pride. Mark 10:15, 24, 31.

Carnality. 1 Cor. 3:1-15.

Not feeding the flock. Matt. 24:45-51.

Taking away the key of knowledge-substituting man's theories for God's truth. Luke 11:52.

Taking the sword. Rev. 13:10.

Yielding to the natural love for self-preservation. John 12:24-25.

Lack of spiritual fruit in the life. John 15:6.

Being workers of iniquity—profiting by the evil principles of the world in commerce, politics, or in any way. Luke 3:13-27.

Lack of fidelity in little things. Luke 16:10.

Defrauding the laborer of his proper wages. James 5:1-5.

Monopoly of natural opportunities. Isa. 5:8-9.

Murmuring-the sin of Israel. Num 14; 1 Cor. 10:1-10.

Lack of watchfulness. Luke 21:2, 36; Ezek. 33.

Failure to fight the good fight of faith. 1 Tim. 6:12; Rev. 3:14-20.

Turning back. Luke 14:25-33.

Lack of fidelity in teachers and preachers. Ezek. 33; Matt. 24:45-51.

Impurity. 1 Thess. 4:6-7; 2 Cor. 12:19-21; Heb. 12:14.

{Failure to preach the "gospel of the kingdom" "to the Jew first" and thereby not "hasting unto the coming of the day of God". Mt 24:14; Ro 1:16; 2 Pe 3:11-12; Isa. 60:22. My wildcat summary: ESN.-ed.**}**

"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." Revelation 2:11